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Appendix A. Interviewee Consent Letter for Interview

Interviewee Consent Form

Copy for Participant

Project Title: Influences On The Identification Of The Gifted: Phase 2

Principal Investigator: Dr Elizabeth Labone
Student Researcher: Cathy Young

I ................................................... (the participant) have read (or have had read to me) and understood the information provided in the Letter to Participants. Any questions I have asked have been answered to my satisfaction. I agree to participate in this 30-60 minute audio-taped interview realizing that I can withdraw my consent without comment.

I agree that research data collected for the study may be published or may be provided to other researchers in a form that does not identify me in any way.

NAME OF PARTICIPANT: (please print)

Contact Phone Number: ......................... Email Address: .................................................................

SIGNATURE: ................................................................. DATE .................................................

SIGNATURE OF PRINCIPAL SUPERVISOR:
DATE:.................................

SIGNATURE OF STUDENT RESEARCHER:
DATE:.................................
Appendix B. Interviewee Consent Letter for Access to Survey data - Participant Copy

Interviewee Consent Form – for access to survey data

*Copy for Participant*

**Project Title:** Influences On The Identification Of The Gifted: Phase 2

**Principal Investigator:** Dr Elizabeth Labone

**Student Researcher:** Cathy Young

Please complete the following section if are willing to have your survey data accessed

I ................................................................. (the participant) have read and understood the information provided in the Letter to Participants. Any questions I have asked have been answered to my satisfaction. I give consent for the researchers to access my survey responses. I understand that I can withdraw my consent at any time without adverse consequences. I agree that research data collected for the study may be published or may be provided to other researchers in a form that does not identify me in any way.

NAME OF PARTICIPANT: (please print)

SIGNATURE: ............................................ DATE ...................................

SIGNATURE OF PRINCIPAL SUPERVISOR:
DATE: 17/8/13

SIGNATURE OF STUDENT RESEARCHER:
DATE: 17/8/13
Appendix C. Consent Letter for Access to Documents

Principal Consent Form – access to schools documents

Copy for Researcher

Project Title: Influences On The Identification Of The Gifted: Phase 2

Principal Investigator Dr Elizabeth Labone
Student Researcher: Cathy Young

I ................................................................ (the Principal) have read (or have had read to me) and understood the information provided in the Letter to Participants. Any questions I have asked have been answered to my satisfaction. I agree to gather and to make available documents related to Gifted Education in the school. I understand that I can withdraw my consent without comment.

I agree that research data collected for the study may be published or may be provided to other researchers in a form that does not identify me or the school in any way.

NAME OF PARTICIPANT: (please print)
Contact Phone Number: .......................... Email Address: ............................................................

SIGNATURE: ................................................................ DATE ..............................
..............................................

SIGNATURE OF PRINCIPAL SUPERVISOR:
DATE: 17 / 8/ 13

SIGNATURE OF STUDENT RESEARCHER:  
DATE: 17/ 8 13
Online Survey for Principals: Influences on the Identification of the Gifted

This survey is to explore the experiences, knowledge and attitudes you have in the identification of gifted students

PART A: GENERAL INFORMATION

School Suburb *

School Name *

Current school enrolment *from February Census

Please indicate your age range in years *

Gender *

Number of years teaching experience *

Number of years in a formally-appointed leadership position in schools *

Number of years at the current school *

Number of years directly and actively involved in the identification of gifted students *

Formal qualifications and/or training in gifted education *

Postgraduate in gifted education
Certificate in gifted education

Mini-certificate in gifted education

Program of in-school professional learning in gifted education

Single inservice or professional learning session in gifted education

No training, qualification or professional learning in gifted education

Other: ______________________

Professional experiences with the identification of giftedness *

Teaching or taught a gifted student

Previous involvement in a gifted education identification program

Leading colleagues who are identifying gifted students

Little or no professional experience

Other: ______________________

Personal experiences with identifying giftedness *

A gifted family member

A gifted friend

Recognize self as gifted

Little or no personal experience

Other: ______________________

Number of students currently in the school who have been formally identified as gifted *
______________________________
Part B (i) : OPINIONS ABOUT THE GIFTED AND THEIR EDUCATION

Gagné and Nadeau's Attitude Scale questionnaire; used with permission of the author - Use the scale below to give your opinion. - Click the description which best represents your opinion. - Answer as spontaneously as possible. - Please answer all questions. - Use 'undecided' as little as possible. SCALE : 1 = totally disagree 2 = partially disagree 3 = undecided 4 = partially agree 5 = totally agree

1. Our schools should offer special educational services for the gifted. *
   - 1. totally disagree
   - 2. partially disagree
   - 3. undecided
   - 4. partially agree
   - 5. totally agree

2. The best way to meet the needs of the gifted is to put them in special classes. *
   - 1. totally disagree
   - 2. partially disagree
   - 3. undecided
   - 4. partially agree
   - 5. totally agree

3. Children with difficulties have the most need of special educational services. *
   - 1. totally disagree
   - 2. partially disagree
   - 3. undecided
   - 4. partially agree
   - 5. totally agree

4. Special programs for gifted children have the drawback of creating elitism. *
1. totally disagree
2. partially disagree
3. undecided
4. partially agree
5. totally agree

5. Special educational services for the gifted are a mark of privilege. *
1. totally disagree
2. partially disagree
3. undecided
4. partially agree
5. totally agree

6. When the gifted are put in special classes, the other children feel devalued. *
1. totally disagree
2. partially disagree
3. undecided
4. partially agree
5. totally agree

7. Most gifted children who skip a grade have difficulties in their social adjustment to a group of older students. *
1. totally disagree
2. partially disagree
3. undecided
4. partially agree
5. totally agree

8. It is more damaging for a gifted child to waste time in class than to adapt to skipping a grade. *
   1. totally disagree
   2. partially disagree
   3. undecided
   4. partially agree
   5. totally agree

9. Gifted children are often bored in school. *
   1. totally disagree
   2. partially disagree
   3. undecided
   4. partially agree
   5. totally agree

10. Children who skip a grade are usually pressured to do so by their parents. *
    1. totally disagree
    2. partially disagree
    3. undecided
    4. partially agree
    5. totally agree

11. The gifted waste their time in regular classes. *
    1. totally disagree
    2. partially disagree
12. We have a greater moral responsibility to give special help to children with difficulties than to gifted children. *

1. totally disagree
2. partially disagree
3. undecided
4. partially agree
5. totally agree

13. Gifted persons are a valuable resource for our society. *

1. totally disagree
2. partially disagree
3. undecided
4. partially agree
5. totally agree

14. The specific educational needs of the gifted are too often ignored in our schools. *

1. totally disagree
2. partially disagree
3. undecided
4. partially agree
5. totally agree

15. The gifted need special attention in order to fully develop their talents. *
16. Our schools are already adequate in meeting the needs of the gifted. *

○ 1. totally disagree
○ 2. partially disagree
○ 3. undecided
○ 4. partially agree
○ 5. totally agree

17. I would very much like to be considered a gifted person. *

○ 1. totally disagree
○ 2. partially disagree
○ 3. undecided
○ 4. partially agree
○ 5. totally agree

18. It is parents who have the major responsibility for helping gifted children develop their talents. *

○ 1. totally disagree
○ 2. partially disagree
○ 3. undecided
○ 4. partially agree
19. A child who has been identified as gifted has more difficulty in making friends. *

- 1. totally disagree
- 2. partially disagree
- 3. undecided
- 4. partially agree
- 5. totally agree

20. Gifted children should be left in regular classes, since they serve as an intellectual stimulant for the other children. *

- 1. totally disagree
- 2. partially disagree
- 3. undecided
- 4. partially agree
- 5. totally agree

21. By separating students into gifted and other groups, we increase the labelling of children as strong-weak, good-less good, etc *

- 1. totally disagree
- 2. partially disagree
- 3. undecided
- 4. partially agree
- 5. totally agree

22. Some teachers feel their authority threatened by gifted children. *

- 1. totally disagree
23. The gifted are already favoured in our schools.

1. totally disagree
2. partially disagree
3. undecided
4. partially agree
5. totally agree

24. In order to progress, a society must develop the talents of gifted individuals to a maximum.

1. totally disagree
2. partially disagree
3. undecided
4. partially agree
5. totally agree

25. By offering special educational services to the gifted we prepare the future members of a dominant class.

1. totally disagree
2. partially disagree
3. undecided
4. partially agree
5. totally agree
26. Tax-payers should not have to pay for special education for the minority of children who are gifted *
   1. totally disagree
   2. partially disagree
   3. undecided
   4. partially agree
   5. totally agree

27. Average children are the major resource of our society; so, they should be the focus of our attention. *
   1. totally disagree
   2. partially disagree
   3. undecided
   4. partially agree
   5. totally agree

28. Gifted children might become vain or egotistical if they are given special attention. *
   1. totally disagree
   2. partially disagree
   3. undecided
   4. partially agree
   5. totally agree

29. When skipping a grade, gifted students miss important ideas (they have "holes" in their knowledge). *
   1. totally disagree
   2. partially disagree
30. Since we invest supplementary funds for children with difficulties, we should do the same for the gifted. *

31. Often, gifted children are rejected because people are envious of them. *

32. The regular school program stifles the intellectual curiosity of gifted children. *

33. The leaders of tomorrow’s society will come mostly from the gifted of today. *
34. A greater number of gifted children should be allowed to skip a grade. *

- 1. totally disagree
- 2. partially disagree
- 3. undecided
- 4. partially agree
- 5. totally agree

35. In reference to the above statements 1 - 34, additional comments I would like to make are......

Part B (ii): Opinions About Identification of Gifted Students

1. Diocesan system schools should implement effective identification programs for the gifted *

- 1. totally disagree
- 2. partially disagree
- 3. undecided
- 4. partially agree
2. The best way to identify the needs of the gifted is to use multiple criteria and measures. *
   - 1. totally disagree
   - 2. partially disagree
   - 3. undecided
   - 4. partially agree
   - 5. totally agree

3. It is more important to identify children with learning difficulties than it is to identify gifted students. *
   - 1. totally disagree
   - 2. partially disagree
   - 3. undecided
   - 4. partially agree
   - 5. totally agree

4. Identifying gifted students has the danger of leading to elitism. *
   - 1. totally disagree
   - 2. partially disagree
   - 3. undecided
   - 4. partially agree
   - 5. totally agree

5. Most of the diocesan system schools don't have any gifted students. *
   - 1. totally disagree
   - 2. partially disagree
3. undecided
4. partially agree
5. totally agree

6. Identification enables a better match of program options for gifted students. *
1. totally disagree
2. partially disagree
3. undecided
4. partially agree
5. totally agree

7. Diocesan system schools adequately identify gifted students. *
1. totally disagree
2. partially disagree
3. undecided
4. partially agree
5. totally agree

8. I believe I am a gifted person, but have never been identified as one. *
1. totally disagree
2. partially disagree
3. undecided
4. partially agree
5. totally agree
9. It is parents’ responsibility, not schools, to ensure their gifted child is identified. *
   - 1. totally disagree
   - 2. partially disagree
   - 3. undecided
   - 4. partially agree
   - 5. totally agree

10. By identifying the gifted, we create inequities amongst students. *
    - 1. totally disagree
    - 2. partially disagree
    - 3. undecided
    - 4. partially agree
    - 5. totally agree

11. Some teachers prefer gifted students not be identified. *
    - 1. totally disagree
    - 2. partially disagree
    - 3. undecided
    - 4. partially agree
    - 5. totally agree

12. Gifted students don’t need to be identified because they learn anyway. *
    - 1. totally disagree
    - 2. partially disagree
    - 3. undecided
    - 4. partially agree
5. totally agree

13. More funding and resources should be directed towards the identification of gifted students. *
   - 1. totally disagree
   - 2. partially disagree
   - 3. undecided
   - 4. partially agree
   - 5. totally agree

14. There are numerous benefits in identifying gifted students. *
   - 1. totally disagree
   - 2. partially disagree
   - 3. undecided
   - 4. partially agree
   - 5. totally agree

15. In reference to the above statements 1 - 14, additional comments I would like to make are......

16. I would say my knowledge about the identification of gifted students, was… *
   - comprehensive / extensive
   - adequate
   - sometimes adequate / sometimes inadequate
somewhat inadequate
minimal / very limited

17. In my professional experience as a teacher I have been directly involved in the identification of a gifted student........ *

- more than 40 times
- 31-40 times
- 21-30 times
- 11-20 times
- 0-10 times

18. Overall, my attitudes about the identification of gifted students are.... *

- very positive
- positive / supportive
- ambivalent / indifferent
- negative
- very negative

Part C

Identification Practices in Your Current School
Please tick the boxes that describe the identification measures / practices your school currently provides.

At our school...... *

- Identification usually occurs at the beginning of each school year
- Identification is part of our enrolment process
- Identification occurs throughout the student’s learning experiences each year
- Identification occurs at specific points in time each year
Pre-testing is also used as a tool for identification

Identification is an ongoing process at our school

Identification practices and procedures are documented in our school policies and/or other school documentation

Identification is seen as having a diagnostic purpose

Subjective measures such as structured observations of the student are used in the identification of gifted students

Teacher nomination is used in the identification of gifted students

Parent nomination is used in the identification of gifted students

Peer nomination is used in the identification of gifted students

Self nomination is used in the identification of gifted students

Student files of previous records and reports are used in the identification of gifted students

Objective measures such as standardised tests of ability or achievement are used in the identification of gifted students

Off-level, or above-level testing, is used in the identification of gifted students

IQ tests and other forms of psychometric testing are used in the identification of gifted students

Both objective and subjective measures of identification are used to provide evidence in the identification of gifted students

Identification involves gathering evidence of a students’ ability (potential), regardless of their current level of performance

We employ identification procedures which are designed to find students who are not achieving at levels commensurate with their ability

The main purpose of identification of gifted students is to help teachers know who falls within the gifted range

The main purpose of identification of gifted students is to gather information that initiates appropriate curriculum and programs for gifted students

Underachievement in gifted learners has been identified as a challenging issue
As Principal, I am willing to nominate this school to be considered for further research about the identification of gifted students.
Online Survey for Teachers/Coordinators/APs: Influences on the Identification of the Gifted

This survey is to explore the experiences, knowledge and attitudes you have in the identification of gifted students

*Required

PART A: GENERAL INFORMATION

School Suburb *

School Name *

Please indicate your age range in years *

Gender *

The position you currently hold in the school *
More than one can be selected

- Kindergarten Teacher
- Year 1 teacher
- Year 2 teacher
- Coordinator 2 or Coordinator 1
- Gifted Education Coordinator (or Gifted Education Reference Teacher)
- Religious Education Coordinator
- Assistant Principal
- Principal

Number of years teaching experience *

Number of years in a formally-appointed leadership position in schools *
Number of years at the current school *

Number of years directly and actively involved in the identification of gifted students *

Formal qualifications and/or training in gifted education *

- Postgraduate in gifted education
- Certificate in gifted education
- Mini-certificate in gifted education
- Program of in-school professional learning in gifted education
- Single inservice or professional learning session in gifted education
- No training, qualification or professional learning in gifted education
- Other: 

Professional experiences with the identification of giftedness *

- Teaching or taught a gifted student
- Previous involvement in a gifted education identification program
- Leading colleagues who are identifying gifted students
- Little or no professional experience
- Other: 

Personal experiences with identifying giftedness *

- A gifted family member
- A gifted friend
- Recognize self as gifted
- Little or no personal experience
- Other: 

Part B: OPINIONS ABOUT THE GIFTED AND THEIR EDUCATION

Gagné and Nadeau’s Attitude Scale questionnaire; used with permission of the author. - Use the scale below to give your opinion. - Click the description which best represents your opinion. - Answer as spontaneously as possible. - Please answer all questions. - Use 'undecided' as little as possible.

SCALE: 1 = totally disagree 2 = partially disagree 3 = undecided 4 = partially agree 5 = totally agree

1. Our schools should offer special educational services for the gifted. *
   - 1. totally disagree
   - 2. partially disagree
   - 3. undecided
   - 4. partially agree
   - 5. totally agree

2. The best way to meet the needs of the gifted is to put them in special classes. *
   - 1. totally disagree
   - 2. partially disagree
   - 3. undecided
   - 4. partially agree
   - 5. totally agree

3. Children with difficulties have the most need of special educational services. *
   - 1. totally disagree
   - 2. partially disagree
   - 3. undecided
   - 4. partially agree
   - 5. totally agree

4. Special programs for gifted children have the drawback of creating elitism. *
   - 1. totally disagree
   - 2. partially disagree
   - 3. undecided
   - 4. partially agree
5. Special educational services for the gifted are a mark of privilege. *

1. totally disagree
2. partially disagree
3. undecided
4. partially agree
5. totally agree

6. When the gifted are put in special classes, the other children feel devalued. *

1. totally disagree
2. partially disagree
3. undecided
4. partially agree
5. totally agree

7. Most gifted children who skip a grade have difficulties in their social adjustment to a group of older students. *

1. totally disagree
2. partially disagree
3. undecided
4. partially agree
5. totally agree

8. It is more damaging for a gifted child to waste time in class than to adapt to skipping a grade. *

1. totally disagree
2. partially disagree
3. undecided
4. partially agree
5. totally agree
9. Gifted children are often bored in school. *
   - 1. totally disagree
   - 2. partially disagree
   - 3. undecided
   - 4. partially agree
   - 5. totally agree

10. Children who skip a grade are usually pressured to do so by their parents. *
   - 1. totally disagree
   - 2. partially disagree
   - 3. undecided
   - 4. partially agree
   - 5. totally agree

11. The gifted waste their time in regular classes. *
   - 1. totally disagree
   - 2. partially disagree
   - 3. undecided
   - 4. partially agree
   - 5. totally agree

12. We have a greater moral responsibility to give special help to children with difficulties than to gifted children. *
   - 1. totally disagree
   - 2. partially disagree
   - 3. undecided
   - 4. partially agree
   - 5. totally agree

13. Gifted persons are a valuable resource for our society. *
14. The specific educational needs of the gifted are too often ignored in our schools. *
   1. totally disagree
   2. partially disagree
   3. undecided
   4. partially agree
   5. totally agree

15. The gifted need special attention in order to fully develop their talents. *
   1. totally disagree
   2. partially disagree
   3. undecided
   4. partially agree
   5. totally agree

16. Our schools are already adequate in meeting the needs of the gifted. *
   1. totally disagree
   2. partially disagree
   3. undecided
   4. partially agree
   5. totally agree

17. I would very much like to be considered a gifted person. *
   1. totally disagree
   2. partially disagree
18. It is parents who have the major responsibility for helping gifted children develop their talents.*

1. totally disagree
2. partially disagree
3. undecided
4. partially agree
5. totally agree

19. A child who has been identified as gifted has more difficulty in making friends.*

1. totally disagree
2. partially disagree
3. undecided
4. partially agree
5. totally agree

20. Gifted children should be left in regular classes, since they serve as an intellectual stimulant for the other children.*

1. totally disagree
2. partially disagree
3. undecided
4. partially agree
5. totally agree

21. By separating students into gifted and other groups, we increase the labelling of children as strong-weak, good-less good, etc.*

1. totally disagree
2. partially disagree
3. undecided
22. Some teachers feel their authority threatened by gifted children. *
   - 1. totally disagree
   - 2. partially disagree
   - 3. undecided
   - 4. partially agree
   - 5. totally agree

23. The gifted are already favoured in our schools. *
   - 1. totally disagree
   - 2. partially disagree
   - 3. undecided
   - 4. partially agree
   - 5. totally agree

24. In order to progress, a society must develop the talents of gifted individuals to a maximum. *
   - 1. totally disagree
   - 2. partially disagree
   - 3. undecided
   - 4. partially agree
   - 5. totally agree

25. By offering special educational services to the gifted we prepare the future members of a dominant class *
   - 1. totally disagree
   - 2. partially disagree
   - 3. undecided
   - 4. partially agree
26. Tax-payers should not have to pay for special education for the minority of children who are gifted.

- 1. totally disagree
- 2. partially disagree
- 3. undecided
- 4. partially agree
- 5. totally agree

27. Average children are the major resource of our society; so, they should be the focus of our attention.

- 1. totally disagree
- 2. partially disagree
- 3. undecided
- 4. partially agree
- 5. totally agree

28. Gifted children might become vain or egotistical if they are given special attention.

- 1. totally disagree
- 2. partially disagree
- 3. undecided
- 4. partially agree
- 5. totally agree

29. When skipping a grade, gifted students miss important ideas (they have "holes" in their knowledge).

- 1. totally disagree
- 2. partially disagree
- 3. undecided
- 4. partially agree
30. Since we invest supplementary funds for children with difficulties, we should do the same for the gifted. *

- 1. totally disagree
- 2. partially disagree
- 3. undecided
- 4. partially agree
- 5. totally agree

31. Often, gifted children are rejected because people are envious of them. *

- 1. totally disagree
- 2. partially disagree
- 3. undecided
- 4. partially agree
- 5. totally agree

32. The regular school program stifles the intellectual curiosity of gifted children. *

- 1. totally disagree
- 2. partially disagree
- 3. undecided
- 4. partially agree
- 5. totally agree

33. The leaders of tomorrow’s society will come mostly from the gifted of today. *

- 1. totally disagree
- 2. partially disagree
- 3. undecided
- 4. partially agree
- 5. totally agree
34. A greater number of gifted children should be allowed to skip a grade. *

- 1. totally disagree
- 2. partially disagree
- 3. undecided
- 4. partially agree
- 5. totally agree

35. In reference to the above statements 1 - 34, additional comments I would like to make are......

Part B: Opinions About Identification of Gifted Students

1. Diocesan system schools should implement effective identification programs for the gifted *

- 1. totally disagree
- 2. partially disagree
- 3. undecided
- 4. partially agree
- 5. totally agree

2. The best way to identify the needs of the gifted is to use multiple criteria and measures. *

- 1. totally disagree
- 2. partially disagree
- 3. undecided
- 4. partially agree
- 5. totally agree
3. It is more important to identify children with learning difficulties than it is to identify gifted students. *

1. totally disagree
2. partially disagree
3. undecided
4. partially agree
5. totally agree

4. Identifying gifted students has the danger of leading to elitism. *

1. totally disagree
2. partially disagree
3. undecided
4. partially agree
5. totally agree

5. Most of the diocesan system schools don't have any gifted students. *

1. totally disagree
2. partially disagree
3. undecided
4. partially agree
5. totally agree

6. Identification enables a better match of program options for gifted students. *

1. totally disagree
2. partially disagree
3. undecided
4. partially agree
5. totally agree

7. Diocesan system schools adequately identify gifted students. *

1. totally disagree
2. partially disagree
3. undecided
4. partially agree
5. totally agree

8. I believe I am a gifted person, but have never been identified as one. *
   1. totally disagree
   2. partially disagree
   3. undecided
   4. partially agree
   5. totally agree

9. It is parents’ responsibility, not schools, to ensure their gifted child is identified. *
   1. totally disagree
   2. partially disagree
   3. undecided
   4. partially agree
   5. totally agree

10. By identifying the gifted, we create inequities amongst students. *
    1. totally disagree
    2. partially disagree
    3. undecided
    4. partially agree
    5. totally agree

11. Some teachers prefer gifted students not be identified. *
    1. totally disagree
    2. partially disagree
    3. undecided
12. Gifted students don’t need to be identified because they learn anyway. *

1. totally disagree
2. partially disagree
3. undecided
4. partially agree
5. totally agree

13. More funding and resources should be directed towards the identification of gifted students. *

1. totally disagree
2. partially disagree
3. undecided
4. partially agree
5. totally agree

14. There are numerous benefits in identifying gifted students. *

1. totally disagree
2. partially disagree
3. undecided
4. partially agree
5. totally agree

15. In reference to the above statements 1 - 14, additional comments I would like to make are......

16. I would say my knowledge about the identification of gifted students, was… *
17. In my professional experience as a teacher I have been directly involved in the identification of a gifted student......... *

- more than 40 times
- 31-40 times
- 21-30 times
- 11-20 times
- 0-10 times

18. Overall, my attitudes about the identification of gifted students are.... *

- very positive
- positive / supportive
- ambivalent / indifferent
- negative
- very negative

Identification Practices in Your Current School

Please tick the boxes that describe the identification measures / practices your school currently provides.

At our school...... *

- Identification usually occurs at the beginning of each school year
- Identification is part of our enrolment process
- Identification occurs throughout the student's learning experiences each year
- Identification occurs at specific points in time each year
- Pre-testing is also used as a tool for identification
Identification is an ongoing process at our school.

Identification practices and procedures are documented in our school policies and/or other school documentation.

Identification is seen as having a diagnostic purpose.

Subjective measures such as structured observations of the student are used in the identification of gifted students.

Teacher nomination is used in the identification of gifted students.

Parent nomination is used in the identification of gifted students.

Peer nomination is used in the identification of gifted students.

Self nomination is used in the identification of gifted students.

Student files of previous records and reports are used in the identification of gifted students.

Objective measures such as standardised tests of ability or achievement are used in the identification of gifted students.

Off-level, or above-level testing, is used in the identification of gifted students.

IQ tests and other forms of psychometric testing are used in the identification of gifted students.

Both objective and subjective measures of identification are used to provide evidence in the identification of gifted students.

Identification involves gathering evidence of a student's ability (potential), regardless of their current level of performance.

We employ identification procedures which are designed to find students who are not achieving at levels commensurate with their ability.

The main purpose of identification of gifted students is to help teachers know who falls within the gifted range.

The main purpose of identification of gifted students is to gather information that initiates appropriate curriculum and programs for gifted students.

Underachievement in gifted learners has been identified as a challenging issue.

Appendix F. Intranet Advanced Notice - Principals
Notice To All Principals of Systemic Primary Schools

Re: Influences On The Identification Of The Gifted Research Project

A Research Project is being undertaken under the supervision of Australian Catholic University (ACU). The research is investigating the influence of educators’ knowledge, attitudes experiences on the identification of gifted students. This study is being undertaken by student researcher Catherine Young, within the degree of Doctor of Education at Australian Catholic University (ACU).

The first phase of the research will involve an online survey

The research has two phases. Phase One involves an online survey of key staff members from all primary schools within the [diocesan system of schools] as listed below,

Principal
Assistant Principal
a Coordinator
Gifted Education Coordinator
Kindergarten teacher
Year 1 teacher, and
Year 2 teacher

An Information Letter to Participants for Phase One detailing the research purpose and processes is attached to this notice. The survey would take 20-25 minutes to complete.

Phase Two will involve a case study of factors related to the identification of gifted students in six schools. This would involve an interview with key staff members, and would take between 30-60 minutes. Principals are invited, in the online survey, to indicate their interest in being considered for Phase Two as a case study school.

Consent has been obtained from [school system office], as part of the ACU ethical approval to request the email addresses of the relevant staff to be used to invite their participation in the study and, if consenting, to organise interviews.

This research is expected to be of benefit in determining factors or variables that influence the identification of gifted students in our Catholic primary schools. Opportunities will be taken to share the findings of the research with all primary schools.

This research has received the approval of the Catholic Education Office, and the Human Research Ethics Committee at Australian Catholic University.
Appendix G. Intranet Advanced Notice - Teachers

Notice To Staff of Systemic Primary Schools
Re: Influences On The Identification Of The Gifted Research Project

A Research Project is being undertaken under the supervision of Australian Catholic University (ACU). The research is investigating the influence of educators’ knowledge, attitudes and experiences on the identification of gifted students. This study is being undertaken by student researcher Catherine Young, within the degree of Doctor of Education at Australian Catholic University (ACU).

The first phase of the research will involve an online survey.

The research has two phases. Phase One involves an online survey of key staff members from all primary schools within the [diocesan system of schools] as listed below:

Principal
Assistant Principal
a Coordinator
Gifted Education Coordinator
Kindergarten teacher
Year 1 teacher, and
Year 2 teacher

An Information Letter to Participants for Phase One detailing the research purpose and processes is attached to this notice. The survey would take 20-25 minutes to complete.

Phase Two will involve a case study of factors related to the identification of gifted students in six schools. This would involve an interview with key staff members, and would take between 30-60 minutes. Principals are invited, in the online survey, to indicate their interest in being considered for Phase Two as a case study school.

Consent has been obtained from [school system office] as part of the ACU ethical approval to request the email addresses of the relevant staff to be used to invite their participation in the study and, if consenting, to organise interviews.

This research is expected to be of benefit in determining factors or variables that influence the identification of gifted students in our Catholic primary schools. Opportunities will be taken to share the findings of the research with all primary schools.

This research has received the approval of the Catholic Education Office, and the Human Research Ethics Committee at Australian Catholic University.
INFORMATION LETTER TO PARTICIPANTS - Principal

Project Title: Influences On The Identification Of The Gifted: Phase 1

Principal Investigator: Dr Elizabeth Labone
Student Researcher: Catherine Young
Student’s Degree: Doctor of Education

Dear Principal,

You are invited to participate in a research project that will investigate the influence of leader and teacher knowledge, experience and attitudes on the identification of gifted students in system Catholic Primary schools. This study is being undertaken by student researcher Catherine Young, within the degree of Doctor of Education at Australian Catholic University (ACU).

What is the project about?

The study seeks to understand the relationship between the knowledge, attitudes and experiences of educators and the identification of gifted students. Identification is an important step in a school’s education plan for gifted student. Specifically this research explores the contribution of educators’ knowledge, attitudes and to the formation of their personal and professional practice in gifted education, and the influence this has on their approaches and practices towards the identification of gifted students.

Who is being asked to be involved in the project?

With their consent, the project will directly involve you, as principal, and six members of your school staff: Assistant Principal, a Coordinator), Gifted Education Coordinator, and 3 teachers – one from each grade of Kindergarten, Year 1 and Year 2.

What will I be asked to do?

Participation in Phase One of this study will involve the completion of one online questionnaire, which is estimated to take approximately 20-25 minutes. The surveys will be de-identified by an independent research assistant, and therefore individual participant’s survey responses will be confidential. As participation in the survey is voluntary, completion and submission of the survey will be taken as consent to participate.
At the end of the survey principals have the opportunity to indicate interest in their school participating in Phase Two of this study. Phase Two involves case studies of six schools in the Archdiocese. Phase Two will involve follow up interviews will take approximately 30-60 minutes and be held at your school at a time convenient to you. This interview will be audio-recorded on a digital recorder. This phase will also involve an analysis of school based documentation related to gifted education. Additionally staff involved in Phase Two will be invited to consent to re-identification of their survey data collected in Phase One. Consent has been obtained from [diocesan system of schools] as part of the ACU ethical approval to request the email addresses of the relevant staff to be used to invite their participation in the study and, if consenting, to organise interviews.

*What are the benefits of the research project?*

Your participation in this research will help to inform understandings about the influences on the identification of gifted students. This research is of considerable interest to those responsible for ensuring the strengths and needs of the diversity of learners are being addressed within Catholic primary schools. Of particular interest are the factors that support schools to be identifiers of gifted students.

*Are there any risks associated with participating in this project?*

There are no foreseeable risks or harm associated with participating in this research. However, you are asked to give 20-25 minutes of your time to complete an online survey if you decide to participate. Key findings from this research may be disseminated in academic or [school system office] publications.

Participation in this study is completely voluntary. You are not under any obligation to participate. If you agree to participate, you can withdraw from the study at any time, without adverse consequences. It is important to note, however, that if you withdraw after you submit your survey, your survey will need to be re-identified by the research assistant so as to be removed and deleted.

Confidentiality is protected as your response will be de-identified and data collected will be aggregated. Aggregated data will be used in any publication arising from this research and the names of schools or participants will not be identifiable.

*Who do I contact if I have questions about the project?*

Any questions regarding this project should be directed to the Principal Investigator, Dr Elizabeth Labone or the Student Researcher, Cathy Young.

Dr Elizabeth Labone  
Acting Deputy Head (Research) NSW/ACT  
Faculty of Education  
Australian Catholic University Limited  
Locked Bag 2002, Strathfield NSW 2135  
Tel. +61 2 9701 4130 Fax +61 2 9701 4240 Email: elizabeth.labone@acu.edu.au

Cathy Young  
Email: cmyoun002@myacu.edu.au

*What if I have a complaint or any concerns?*

The study has been approved by the Human Research Ethics Committee at Australian Catholic University (approval number 2012 xxxx). If you have any complaints or concerns about the conduct of the project, you may write to the Chair of the Human Research Ethics Committee care of the Office of the Deputy Vice Chancellor (Research).
Chair, HREC  
c/o Office of the Deputy Vice Chancellor (Research)  
Australian Catholic University, Melbourne Campus  
Locked Bag 4115  
FITZROY, VIC, 3065  
Ph: 03 9953 3150   Fax: 03 9953 3315   Email: res.ethics@acu.edu.au

Any complaint or concern will be treated in confidence and fully investigated. You will be informed of the outcome.

_I want to participate! How do I sign up?_

If you wish to participate in this project please:

  * click on the survey link provided below and complete and submit the online survey; and

  * if you would consider having your school participate in a follow up case study indicate this at the end of the survey by clicking ‘Yes” to the option “I am willing to nominate this school to be considered for further research about the identification of gifted students”.

**Click here to link to Principal’s Survey:**

Surveys will be received up to and including **Friday 21 June 2013**.

Thank you for your time in considering this invitation to participate in this research.

Yours sincerely,

[Signature]

Dr Elizabeth Labone                             Cathy Young  
Principal Investigator                            Student Researcher
INFORMATION LETTER TO PARTICIPANTS

Teachers / Coordinators / Assistant Principal

Project Title: Influences On The Identification Of The Gifted: Phase 1
Principal Investigator: Dr Elizabeth Labone
Student Researcher: Catherine Young
Student’s Degree: Doctor of Education

Dear Participant,

You are invited to participate in a research project that will investigate the influence of leader and teacher knowledge, experience and attitudes on the identification of gifted students in [diocesan system of primary schools]. This study is being undertaken by student researcher Catherine Young, within the degree of Doctor of Education at Australian Catholic University (ACU).

What is the project about?

The study seeks to understand the relationship between the knowledge, attitudes and experiences of educators and the identification of gifted students. Identification is an important step in a school’s education plan for gifted student. Specifically this research explores the contribution of educators’ knowledge, attitudes and to the formation of their personal and professional practice in gifted education, and the influence this has on their approaches and practices towards the identification of gifted students.

Who is being asked to be involved in the project?

With their consent, the project will directly involve seven members of your school staff: Principal, Assistant Principal, a Coordinator, Gifted Education Coordinator, and 3 teachers – one from each grade of Kindergarten, Year 1 and Year 2.

What will I be asked to do?


Participation in Phase One of this study will involve the completion of one online questionnaire, which is estimated to take approximately 20-25 minutes. The surveys will be de-identified by an independent research assistant, and therefore individual participant’s survey responses will be confidential. As participation in the survey is voluntary, completion and submission of the survey will be taken as consent to participate.

Schools may wish to leave open the possibility of participating in future research (Phase Two) about the identification of gifted students. Phase Two involves case studies of six schools in the Archdiocese and will include follow up interviews which will take approximately 30-60 minutes and be held at your school at a time convenient to you. This interview will be audio-recorded on a digital recorder. This phase will also involve an analysis of school based documentation related to gifted education. Additionally staff involved in Phase Two will be invited to consent to re-identification of their survey data collected in Phase one. Principals will be given an opportunity to indicate their willingness to be a case study school at the end of the Principal’s survey. Consent has been obtained from [school system office] as part of the ACU ethical approval to request the email addresses of the relevant staff to be used to invite their participation in the study and, if consenting, to organise interviews.

**What are the benefits of the research project?**

Your participation in this research will help to inform understandings about the influences on the identification of gifted students. This research is of considerable interest to those responsible for ensuring the strengths and needs of the diversity of learners are being addressed within Catholic primary schools. Of particular interest are the factors that support schools to be identifiers of gifted students.

**Are there any risks associated with participating in this project?**

There are no foreseeable risks or harm associated with participating in this research. However, you are asked to give 20-25 minutes of your time to complete an online survey if you decide to participate. Key findings from this research may be disseminated in academic or [school system office] publications.

Participation in this study is completely voluntary. You are not under any obligation to participate. If you agree to participate, you can withdraw from the study at any time, without adverse consequences. It is important to note, however, that if you withdraw after you submit your survey, your survey will need to be re-identified by the research assistant so as to be removed and deleted.

Confidentiality is protected as your response will be de-identified and data collected will be aggregated. Aggregated data will be used in any publication arising from this research and the names of schools or participants will not be identifiable.

**Who do I contact if I have questions about the project?**

Any questions regarding this project should be directed to the Principal Investigator, Dr Elizabeth Labone or the Student Researcher, Cathy Young.

Dr Elizabeth Labone  
Acting Deputy Head (Research) NSW/ACT  
Faculty of Education  
Australian Catholic University Limited
What if I have a complaint or any concerns?

The study has been approved by the Human Research Ethics Committee at Australian Catholic University (approval number 2013 48N). If you have any complaints or concerns about the conduct of the project, you may write to the Chair of the Human Research Ethics Committee care of the Office of the Deputy Vice Chancellor (Research).

Chair, HREC
c/o Office of the Deputy Vice Chancellor (Research)
Australian Catholic University
Melbourne Campus
Locked Bag 4115
FITZROY, VIC, 3065
Ph: 03 9953 3150  Fax: 03 9953 3315  Email: res.ethics@acu.edu.au

Any complaint or concern will be treated in confidence and fully investigated. You will be informed of the outcome.

I want to participate! How do I sign up?

If you wish to participate in this project please:

- click on the survey link provided below and complete and submit the online survey.

Click here for link to Survey

Surveys will be received up to and including Friday 19 July 2013.
Thank you for your time in considering this invitation to participate in this research.

Yours sincerely,

Principal Investigator
Dr Elizabeth Labone

Student Researcher
Cathy Young
Appendix J. Intranet Notice to Participants – Principals – reminder

Notice To All Principals of Systemic Primary Schools

Influences On The Identification Of The Gifted Research Project

Revised deadline: 19 July, 2013 – Friday Week 1, Term 3

This research is investigating the influence of educators’ knowledge, attitudes and experiences on the identification of gifted students. This Research Project is being undertaken under the supervision of Australian Catholic University (ACU).

Requests for participants to respond to the online survey have been emailed. The link to the survey is also provided here for ease of access. The research has two phases. Phase One involves an online survey of key staff members from all primary schools within the [diocesan system of schools] as listed below.

Principal
Assistant Principal
a Coordinator
Gifted Education Coordinator
Kindergarten teacher
Year 1 teacher, and
Year 2 teacher.

An Information Letter to Participants for Phase One detailing the research purpose and processes is attached to this notice.

This study is being undertaken by student researcher Catherine Young, within the degree of Doctor of Education at Australian Catholic University (ACU). This research has received the approval of the Catholic Education Office, and the Human Research Ethics Committee at Australian Catholic University.
Notice To All

Assistant Principals, Coordinators, Gifted Education Coordinators, Kindergarten, Year 1 and Year 2 teachers

Influences On The Identification Of The Gifted Research Project

Revised deadline: 19 July, 2013 – Friday Week 1, Term 3

This research is investigating the influence of educators' knowledge, attitudes and experiences on the identification of gifted students. This Research Project is being undertaken under the supervision of Australian Catholic University (ACU).

Requests for participants to respond to the online survey have been emailed. The link to the survey is also provided here for ease of access. The research has two phases. Phase One involves an online survey of key staff members from all primary schools within the diocesan system of schools as listed below.

Principal
Assistant Principal
a Coordinator
Gifted Education Coordinator
Kindergarten teacher
Year 1 teacher, and
Year 2 teacher.

An Information Letter to Participants for Phase One detailing the research purpose and processes is attached to this notice.

This study is being undertaken by student researcher Catherine Young, within the degree of Doctor of Education at Australian Catholic University (ACU). This research has received the approval of the Catholic Education Office, and the Human Research Ethics Committee at Australian Catholic University.
Appendix L. Interview Questions – Principal

Schedule of Interview Questions – PRINCIPAL

Could you describe in as much detail as possible how you would define / describe a gifted student?
- manifestation of giftedness in cognitive, behavioural and affective domains
- teacher knowledge about characteristics of gifted students

What is the current enrolment of the school?

Suppose a new student is enrolled in your school tomorrow, and you have a hunch s/he to be highly gifted. What would you do?
- degree of confidence in identifying gifted students
- level of knowledge in the identification

3. What if a young new teacher to the staff this year came to you for advice about a student in her/his class they suspect is highly gifted. What would you advise them?
- degree of confidence in identifying gifted students
- level of knowledge in the identification

4. Some people would say that gifted students shouldn’t need to be identified and be given consideration, as they learn anyway. What would you say?
- recognition of the need for an identification program
- academic benefits of identification for gifted students

5. In general, how would you describe your teachers’ attitudes towards the identification of gifted students?
Prompt: Very Positive, Positive / Supportive, Ambivalent / Indifferent, Negative, Very Negative

6a. When you were a teacher, did you ever teach a student who was identified as gifted?
If yes – How did that go?
- extent of experience with gifted students
6b. If no – did you ever teach a student whom you thought might benefit from being identified? Can you tell me about that student?

- extent of experience with gifted students

7a. Have you ever been responsible as a Principal for implementing an identification program? If yes – can you tell me about this? If no - go to question 8

- key elements of an effective identification program
- the importance of identification as a school process

7b. What issues did you feel important to consider in implementing such a program?

- key elements of an effective identification program
- the importance of identification as a school process

7c. What form did the identification of gifted students take?

Prompt: what objective or standardized measures / tools were used?
what subjective or non-standardised measures / tools were used?

- key elements of an effective identification program

7d. How were those measures of identification chosen?

- methods used in the identification of gifted students and their effectiveness

8. What do you think the ideal time to begin the identification of a gifted student would be?

- the timing of identification: when and why

9. What do you think the ideal approach to the identification of gifted students would be like? OR (What issues did you feel important to consider in implementing such a program?)

- methods used in the identification of gifted students and their effectiveness
- key elements of an effective identification program
10. Are there any circumstances or conditions that particularly facilitate the identification of gifted students in this school?

**Prompt:** circumstances or conditions relating to the students, teachers, or the resourcing....
- key elements of an effective identification program
- the timing of identification
- degree of confidence in identifying gifted students
- level of knowledge in the identification

11. Are there any circumstances or conditions that particularly hinder the identification of gifted students, in this school?
- difficulties or challenges of identification
- effectiveness at identifying gifted students from minority groups
- gifted ESL students
- the impact of identification on other children not identified
- identification of gifted students with additional exceptionalities

12. What do you consider the challenges or difficulties of identification?
- difficulties or challenges of identification

13a. Have you ever done any training or inservice in the identification of gifted students?

**Prompt:** as part of postgraduate coursework, significant professional development
- extent of formal training or professional development in gifted education
- adequacy of their training and / or professional development for identification

13b. What did you learn from this training about the identification of gifted students?

**Prompt:** what were the key points?
- adequacy of their training and / or professional development for identification

13c. Do you think your training has adequately equipped you for identification of gifted students?

If yes – can you tell me more about that?

If no – what training is needed for the effective identification of gifted students
- adequacy of their training and / or professional development for identification
- the degree / extent of training needed for effective identification of gifted students

14. How many students currently in this school have been identified as gifted?
- prevalence of the practice of identification within the school
- number of identified gifted students in the school currently

15. Based on your knowledge and own experience as a Principal – would you consider the identification of gifted students an important process in schools? Can you talk further about it?
Appendix M. Interview Questions – Teachers

Schedule of Interview Questions – TEACHERS and LEADERS (not Principal)

Could you describe in as much detail as possible how you would define / describe a gifted student?
- manifestation of giftedness in cognitive, behavioural and affective domains
- teacher knowledge about characteristics of gifted students

Suppose a new student is enrolled in your school tomorrow, and you have a hunch s/he to be highly gifted. What would you do?
- degree of confidence in identifying gifted students
- level of knowledge in the identification

3. What if a young new teacher to the staff this year came to you for advice about a student in her/his class they suspect is highly gifted. What would you advise them?
- degree of confidence in identifying gifted students
- level of knowledge in the identification

4. Some people would say that gifted students shouldn’t need to be identified and be given consideration, as they learn anyway. What would you say?
- recognition of the need for an identification program
- academic benefits of identification for gifted students

5. In general, how would you describe the attitudes of teachers in this school towards the identification of gifted students?

Prompt: Very Positive, Positive / Supportive, Ambivalent / Indifferent, Negative, Very Negative

6a. As a teacher, have you ever taught a student who was identified as gifted? If yes – How did that go?
- extent of experience with gifted students
6b. **If no** – did you ever teach a student whom you thought might benefit from being identified? Can you tell me about that student?

- extent of experience with gifted students

7a. **Have you ever been responsible for implementing an identification program? If yes – can you tell me about this? If no - go to question 8**

- key elements of an effective identification program
- the importance of identification as a school process

7b. **What issues did you feel important to consider in implementing such a program?**

- key elements of an effective identification program
- the importance of identification as a school process

7c. **What form did the identification of gifted students take?**

*Prompt: what objective or standardized measures / tools were used?*

- what subjective or non-standardised measures / tools were used?

- key elements of an effective identification program

7d. **How were those measures of identification chosen?**

- methods used in the identification of gifted students and their effectiveness

8. **What do you think the ideal time to begin the identification of a gifted student would be?**

- the timing of identification: when and why

9. **What do you think the ideal approach to the identification of gifted students would be like?**

*OR  (What issues did you feel important to consider in implementing such a program?)*

- methods used in the identification of gifted students and their effectiveness
- key elements of an effective identification program
10. How have you found the approach to the identification of gifted students in this school? Probe: accessibility and variety of tools? approach of teachers? Policy issues?

- accessibility and variety of objective / standardised tools for identification
- accessibility and variety of subjective / non-standardised tools for identification
- the place of intelligence testing
- the importance of identification as a school process

11. Are there any circumstances or conditions that particularly facilitate the identification of gifted students in this school?

**Prompt**: circumstances or conditions relating to the students, teachers, or the resourcing....

- key elements of an effective identification program
- the timing of identification
- degree of confidence in identifying gifted students
- level of knowledge in the identification

11. Are there any circumstances or conditions that particularly hinder the identification of gifted students, in this school? Prompts as per below:

- difficulties or challenges of identification
- effectiveness at identifying gifted students from minority groups
- gifted ESL students
- the impact of identification on other children not identified
- identification of gifted students with additional exceptionalities

12. What do you consider the challenges or difficulties of identification?

- difficulties or challenges of identification

13a. Have you ever done any training or inservice in the identification of gifted students?

**Prompt**: as part of postgraduate coursework, significant professional development

- extent of formal training or professional development in gifted education
- adequacy of their training and / or professional development for identification

13b. What did you learn from this training about the identification of gifted students?
Prompt: what were the key points?
- adequacy of their training and/or professional development for identification

13c. Do you think your training has adequately equipped you for identification of gifted students?
If yes – can you tell me more about that?
If no – what training is needed for the effective identification of gifted students?
- adequacy of their training and/or professional development for identification
- the degree/extent of training needed for effective identification of gifted students

14. Can you tell me how many students currently in this school have been identified as gifted?
- prevalence of the practice of identification within the school
- number of identified gifted students in the school currently

15. Based on your knowledge and own experience as a teacher and/or leader – would you consider the identification of gifted students an important process in schools? Can you talk further about it
INFORMATION LETTER TO PARTICIPANTS -

Principal, Assistant Principal, Coordinator (REC, Coordinator 2 or Coordinator 1), Gifted Education Coordinator, Teachers (Kindergarten, Year 1 and Year 2)

Project Title: Influences On The Identification Of The Gifted: Phase 2

Principal Investigator: Dr Elizabeth Labone
Student Researcher: Catherine Young
Student’s Degree: Doctor of Education

Dear Participant,

You are invited to participate in a research project that will investigate the influence of leader and teacher knowledge, experience and attitudes on the identification of gifted students in the system of primary schools. This study is being undertaken by student researcher Catherine Young, within the degree of Doctor of Education at Australian Catholic University (ACU).

What is the project about?

The study seeks to understand the relationship between the knowledge, attitudes and experiences of educators and the identification of gifted students. Identification is an important step in a school’s education plan for gifted student. Specifically this research explores the contribution of educators’ knowledge, attitudes and to the formation of their personal and professional practice in gifted education, and the influence this has on their approaches and practices towards the identification of gifted students.

What will I be asked to do?

Your Principal expressed an interest in the school participating in Phase Two of this research project at the time of submitting the online survey. Upon each one’s consent, the project will directly involve seven members of your school staff: Principal, Assistant Principal, a Coordinator Gifted Education Coordinator, and 3 teachers – one from each grade of Kindergarten, Year 1 and Year 2. Participation in this section (Phase Two) of the research will involve you in a 30-60 minute interview, to be held at your school, at a time convenient to you. The interview will be audio-recorded.
The online survey which you previously submitted was de-identified at the time it was received. If you agree to participate in Phase Two of the research, you will also be invited to consent to re-identification of their survey data collected in Phase One. Consent has been obtained from [school system office] as part of the ACU ethical approval to request the email addresses of the relevant staff to be used to invite their participation in the study and, if consenting, to organise interviews.

**What are the benefits of the research project?**

Your participation in this research will help to inform understandings about the influences on the identification of gifted students. This research is of considerable interest to those responsible for ensuring the strengths and needs of the diversity of learners are being addressed within Catholic primary schools. Of particular interest are the factors that support schools to be identifiers of gifted students.

**Are there any risks associated with participating in this project?**

There are no foreseeable risks or harm associated with participating in this research. However, you are asked to give 20-25 minutes of your time to complete an online survey if you decide to participate. Key findings from this research may be disseminated in academic or [school system office] publications.

Participation in this study is completely voluntary. You are not under any obligation to participate. If you agree to participate, you can withdraw from the study at any time, and non-participation or withdrawal will in no way affect your ongoing employment within the school or system. While your identity will be known to the researcher and research assistant confidentiality is protected as the data collected will have all identifiers removed and will be aggregated. Only aggregated data will be used in any publication arising from this research and schools and participants will not be identified.

**Who do I contact if I have questions about the project?**

Any questions regarding this project should be directed to the Principal Investigator, Dr Elizabeth Labone or the Student Researcher, Cathy Young.

Dr Elizabeth Labone  
Acting Deputy Head (Research) NSW/ACT  
Faculty of Education  
Australian Catholic University Limited  
Locked Bag 2002, Strathfield NSW 2135  
Tel. +61 2 9701 4130  Fax +61 2 9701 4240

Email: elizabeth.labone@acu.edu.au

Cathy Young  
Email: cmyoun002@myacu.edu.au
What if I have a complaint or any concerns?

The study has been approved by the Human Research Ethics Committee at Australian Catholic University (approval number 2013 48N). If you have any complaints or concerns about the conduct of the project, you may write to the Chair of the Human Research Ethics Committee care of the Office of the Deputy Vice Chancellor (Research).

Chair, HREC
c/o Office of the Deputy Vice Chancellor (Research)
Australian Catholic University
Melbourne Campus
Locked Bag 4115, FITZROY, VIC, 3065
Ph: 03 9953 3150   Fax: 03 9953 3315   Email: res.ethics@acu.edu.au

Any complaint or concern will be treated in confidence and fully investigated. You will be informed of the outcome.

I want to participate! How do I sign up?

If you wish to participate in Phase Two please complete the attached consent forms. One refers to the interview and one refers to consent for access to your survey data. You are free to consent to both, one or neither. At the time of the interview you will be asked to sign two copies of these consent forms. One copy is for you to retain for your records and the other copy is for the researcher’s records. You will be contacted within the next two weeks to arrange an interview time convenient to you.

Thank you for your time in considering this invitation to participate in this research.

Yours sincerely,

-----------------------------------------------
Principal Investigator
Dr Elizabeth Labone

-----------------------------------------------
Student Researcher
Cathy Young
Appendix O. Sample of Data Coded from Interview Transcript

Step 1

Name: Identification

Coding Description:  
- Attitudes
- Knowledge
- Leadership in identification
- Identification practices

Start of Transcript:

Facilitator: So I’m with staff member 012d. Could you describe in as much detail as possible how you would define or describe a gifted student?

Interviewee: A student who is working a significantly higher level of ability in a particular area, like as many different areas of giftedness. So a student that has particular potential in a particular one of those given areas - academically or artistically - there’s a range of them. Sometimes, though, you have children that, although they have the potential in a particular area obviously performing or unable to meet that potential. We’ve had a few children at our school that are those twice exceptionable type of students.

Facilitator: 2A Suppose a new student is enrolled in your school tomorrow and you have a hunch that he or she to be highly gifted. What would you do?

Interviewee: Well, I think you’d have to gather a range of data informally and formally. So you’d have some screening done, obviously with our learning support teachers - our gifted teacher would probably interview that child. We would probably talk to the parents and we would also do a lot of observation on that child. Then looking at the data that we’ve got from our particular screening tests, then we would - we have learning support meetings here every term - one for K-2 and one to 3-6 and at that meeting, teachers work through systematically children and we, as a team, decide what sorts of things need to be put in place at both ends of the spectrum. So that’s not just children...

Facilitator: So is it all students or is it...

Interviewee: All students. Any questions that teachers might have around a student is put out then to the team.

Facilitator: 2b What factors would contribute to the hunch?

Interviewee: Okay. So it might be in the conversations, the dialog that you have with the child. It could be ... If their vocab might be at significantly much higher level, more sophisticated. Obviously their literacy skills - children that are very young and read very well often - just looking at their work samples. Looking at it comparatively I suppose with your cohort and - if it’s an writing sample for example and a child is allowed - is able to really demonstrate beyond stage level where they should be at, then that would be maybe a sign to you that you needed to perhaps give them opportunities to see what the ceiling is there for that particular child. If it’s maths, they might score really high on a
PAT test that you’ve given for your cohort so you would just then keep re-testing and then giving them, perhaps, other, perhaps, tasks that then give you further information. I think that you can’t really just go on one particular test or one particular piece of evidence; that you really do have to look at many different forms of data. As I said before, working collaboratively with the parents as well as your other professionals at the school. Then if there were not psychometric tests or things done on that child, then perhaps you would recommend that that be done.

Facilitator: 3 What if a new teacher to this staff came to you for advice - a new young teacher came for advice about a student in the class that they suspected was highly gifted, what would you be hearing from the teacher that would indicate to you that giftedness may be present?

Interviewee: It could be a range of things, really. It could be I have concerns about this child because they seem to be very bright and they might be very articulate and able to discuss things very in-depth but when it comes to getting that down, I’m very concerned because there seems to be a discrepancy there between what they can produce in terms of writing and then - so it could be that. Or it might be this child’s very disengaged because often children that are really super-bright are sometimes bored out their brains. It might be that a child is saying to them, I can do this or I’ve done this before or it can be different in every case. Or I’ve got a child that is getting through the work so very quickly, I don’t know what to do next with them. They could be saying a range of things. I mean it just depends...

Facilitator: 3b What would your advice be to this teacher?

Interviewee: Well, I would be saying to this teacher that we need maybe someone on - maybe we need to give you some opportunity to work one on one with this child to gather some more information... that we need to really build up a more in-depth profile on this child. If you are new to the school, or they’re new to the school, we need to really get as much information about this child that we can as quickly as we can. I would maybe refer them to speak to other individuals on staff who have a lot of expertise, maybe show them a range of different tools that maybe they can use or implement with that particular child, that sort of thing, I suppose.

Facilitator: 4 Some people would say gifted students shouldn’t need to be identified and be given consideration as they learn anyway. What would you say to that?

Interviewee: I strongly disagree with that. I think that it’s every child’s right to be working at their God-given potential. I think that it’s a teacher’s job and a responsibility to be working at that zone of proximal development - each child needs to be given the opportunity to achieve what they can achieve. So I think that’s that a very narrow-minded way of looking at things.

Facilitator: 5 In general, how would you describe the attitudes of teachers in this school towards the identification of gifted students?

Interviewee: Look, I think that the teachers at this school are - there’s a lot of young teachers and teachers that are the beginning stage of their career in our school that I think what they lack perhaps in expertise, they more than make up for their willingness - I don’t think that we really had anybody on staff that has that attitude that you were just referring to in that previous question. I think the teachers here are very aware that... I think it’s a very supportive...

Facilitator: Very supportive.
Interviewee: Yeah and I think that we’ve employed recently a gifted teacher who has a lot of expertise in that area and I think she - her working in the classroom - which is the model - and planning with those teachers is really helping them to really grow in this particular area. It’s helping us all.

Facilitator: Is there any negative attitude?

Interviewee: I don’t think negative as such but I think that perhaps in this school because of the area that we’re in - the socioeconomic area we are in - we have a naturally bright clientele, group of students. I think making that distinguishing, being able to distinguish between those children that are identified as gifted and distinguishing those from the children that are bright, I think sometimes that might be a bit of an issue for some of us. So not negative...But perhaps where we need to go is looking into our processes even further for identifying students and...I think we’re doing a lot but you can always learn more.

Step 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>KNOWLEDGE – TEACHERS – HIGH IDENTIFYING SCHOOLS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

A gifted student can achieve - first of all they can access content perhaps at a higher level than their age cohort - their peers - they can achieve higher order thinking, a gifted student could be particularly gifted in an area. It could be academic, at one of the academic areas, it could be musical, it could be emotional; they could be very good at organisational skills; they could be gifted in many areas. (021d, p.1)

They might be very articulate, they might be able to recall things very quickly or able to expand on something... Beyond what I would expect... (021d, p.2)

It’s important that the teachers understand the difference between just a hard working higher achiever and a student who’s actually gifted or got abilities, particularly unrecognised ones… (021d, p.4)

Well, not being trained in it myself and not knowing - I think like I’ve mentioned with the testing that the G&T teacher does, she does the testing, she tells me the results, but a challenge for me is not knowing what the tests are and not knowing what the students have had to do during that test is a challenge, because I think maybe if I was more informed about that then I would be more informed about the whole identification process and what to do about it. (021b, p.7)

It would be quality of their work, the context, their ability to, once again, show me that they’re at a level that is beyond grade level. (05c, p.2)

Someone whose skills are beyond the grade or their year or their knowledge - skills and knowledge. So it’s beyond their age or year. (05c, p.1). ... I suppose use of language, using extended language. Being incredibly articulate, being very fast with numbers. I guess having to be extended. (05c, p.2)

A gifted student is a child who demonstrates a wide range of abilities, a wide range of skills, levels of thinking in their daily routine. Perhaps it could also be an area that is quite specific to their interest that they have a lot of information about and that is like a little red flag that makes you aware that there is something going on in their thinking and their participation in their education. (05b, p.1)
Step 3

**KNOWLEDGE - PRINCIPALS - LOW IDENTIFYING SCHOOLS**

A gifted student? Above average, well distinctly above average in the domain rather than a skill, so in the creative or in the intellectual social creative domains. Yeah (O4P, p. 1)

Yes, so how they respond is I gain a lot of information from that. So usually there's an excitement in their face, they light up, they would start actually talking about what their interest are, and I would probe and ask more questions about what they're talking about. What I sometimes see is then they start asking questions, so I maybe question them about something, they'll tell me some information and they probe me with questions as well. So it becomes more of a mature conversation, it's a whole different level of conversation for a child at their age. (O4P, p. 2)

My concern would probably be that teachers aren't aware of how to identify a gifted child, what to actually look for or how to probe to find more information about being a high ESL school I think our main concern is - our main issue is language, so I think a lot of teachers look for the language. Whereas our kids, sometimes don't have the language to express themselves and could be identified because of that. (O4P, p. 6)

No, I don't know whether there's a particular stage, if they're gifted they'd probably show their giftedness at an early age, I don't know if you could put it to a stage. (O4P, p. 7)

But the conversations I actually have with students in enrollment and the way they articulate to their parents and speak to their parents, it's - you know there's something there. (O4P, p. 9)

Yes, I've done a certificate in gifted and talented. (O4P, p. 9) Yes, it was back then we did. I did some study on how much is in textbooks and how much work is actually repeated. Yes so the teacher taught only through a textbook, how much learning would actually take place for a child, a gifted child, and what a waste of time textbook was. So I was working on that. I did a research study on that. (O4P, p. 10)

Yes but I'd like to review it. When you haven't been in a classroom for so long I think it all becomes a lot harder in identifying. So I think I haven't been in the classroom for seven years or so, so if a teacher came to me about a gifted student, I would actually look at that special needs committee, but I know there are quite a few members of staff who have had some training in G&T. So I would say yes, I do have the knowledge but I don't make the decisions on my own. (O4P, p. 11)

I think professional development yeah, I think yes professional development is required. I wouldn't say a certificate is required but I'd say time here at school I'd look at the identification process first out of everything, I'd start here. Define it. (O4P
Appendix P. Participant Information Letter - Documents

INFORMATION LETTER to PRINCIPAL - DOCUMENTS

Project Title: Influences On The Identification Of The Gifted: Phase 2
Principal Investigator: Dr Elizabeth Labone
Student Researcher: Catherine Young
Student’s Degree: Doctor of Education

Dear Principal,

You are invited to participate in a research project that will investigate the influence of leader and teacher knowledge, experience and attitudes on the identification of gifted students in [system primary schools]. This study is being undertaken by student researcher Catherine Young, within the degree of Doctor of Education at Australian Catholic University (ACU).

What is the project about?
The study seeks to understand the relationship between the knowledge, attitudes and experiences of educators and the identification of gifted students. Identification is an important step in a school’s education plan for gifted students. Specifically this research explores the contribution of educators’ knowledge, attitudes and experiences to the formation of their personal and professional practice in gifted education, and the influence this has on their approaches and practices towards the identification of gifted students.

Are there any risks associated with participating in this project?
There are no foreseeable risks or harm associated with participating in this research. However, if you decide to participate the research will require a time commitment in gathering the documentation indicated below. Confidentiality is protected as your school’s documentation will be de-identified and data collected will be aggregated. Aggregated data will be used in any publication arising from this research and the names of schools or participants will not be identifiable.

What will I be asked to do?
You will be asked to make available some documents related to Gifted Education in your school.
Some documents that could be available are:

Annual Report to the Community
Gifted Education Policy and/or Practice statement and/or Implementation Plan;
Role description for Gifted Education Coordinator;
Other documentation or references to gifted education, for example access to the school’s tracking system for gifted students;
enrolment screening processes;
documented nomination processes and forms for teachers and parents;
evidence of recent Professional Development;
record of attendance at in-service and/or external professional development on gifted education;
timetabling of the role of Gifted Education Coordinator;
release time from class for the Gifted Education Coordinator.

**What are the benefits of the research project?**

Your participation in this research will help to inform understandings about the influences on the identification of gifted students. This research is of considerable interest to those responsible for ensuring the strengths and needs of the diversity of learners are being addressed within Catholic primary schools. Of particular interest are the factors that support schools to be identifiers of gifted students.

**Can I withdraw from the study?**

Participation in this study is completely voluntary. You are not under any obligation to participate. If you agree to participate, you can withdraw from the study at any time without adverse consequences.

**Will I be able to find out the results of the project?**

Key findings from this research may be disseminated in academic or [school system office] publications, and therefore available to participants.

**Who do I contact if I have questions about the project?**

Any questions regarding this project should be directed to the Principal Investigator, Dr Elizabeth Labone or the Student Researcher, Cathy Young.

Dr Elizabeth Labone
Acting Deputy Head (Research) NSW/ACT
Faculty of Education
Australian Catholic University Limited
What if I have a complaint or any concerns?

The study has been approved by the Human Research Ethics Committee at Australian Catholic University (approval number 2013 48N). If you have any complaints or concerns about the conduct of the project, you may write to the Chair of the Human Research Ethics Committee care of the Office of the Deputy Vice Chancellor (Research).

Chair, HREC

c/o Office of the Deputy Vice Chancellor (Research)

Australian Catholic University, Melbourne Campus

Locked Bag 4115

FITZROY, VIC, 3065

Ph: 03 9953 3150   Fax: 03 9953 3315   Email: res.ethics@acu.edu.au

Any complaint or concern will be treated in confidence and fully investigated. You will be informed of the outcome.

I want to participate! How do I sign up?

If you agree to participate in this project, please sign both copies of the Consent Form, retain one for your records and return the other copy to the Principal Investigator or Student Researcher, via the Research Assistant.

Thank you for your time in considering this invitation to participate in this research.

Yours sincerely,

Principal Investigator          Student Researcher
Dr Elizabeth Labone             Cathy Young
## Appendix Q. Demographic Information: All Diocesan Respondents

### Demographic Information: All diocesan respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of participants</th>
<th>Principals</th>
<th>Assistant Principals</th>
<th>Coordinators</th>
<th>Gifted Ed Coordinators</th>
<th>Teachers K-2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>40</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of participants</td>
<td>30 Female</td>
<td>10 Male</td>
<td>18 Female</td>
<td>5 Male</td>
<td>26 Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>26 Female</td>
<td>3 Male</td>
<td>21 Female</td>
<td>0 Male</td>
<td>60 Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>30 Female</td>
<td>10 Male</td>
<td>29 Female</td>
<td>13 Male</td>
<td>30-39 Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>40-49 Female</td>
<td>7 Male</td>
<td>40-49 Female</td>
<td>13 Male</td>
<td>40-49 Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age Range</td>
<td>50-59 Female</td>
<td>12 Male</td>
<td>50-59 Female</td>
<td>8 Male</td>
<td>50-59 Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>60+ Female</td>
<td>12 Male</td>
<td>60+ Male</td>
<td>12 Male</td>
<td>60+ Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># Years teaching</td>
<td>1-5</td>
<td>1-5</td>
<td>1-5</td>
<td>1-5</td>
<td>1-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6-10</td>
<td>1-6</td>
<td>6-10</td>
<td>5-10</td>
<td>5-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11-15</td>
<td>2-11</td>
<td>11-15</td>
<td>5-11</td>
<td>11-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16-20</td>
<td>3-16</td>
<td>16-20</td>
<td>3-16</td>
<td>16-20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>21+</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>21+</td>
<td>12+</td>
<td>21+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># Years at current school</td>
<td>&lt; 3 26</td>
<td>&lt; 3 5</td>
<td>&lt; 3 11</td>
<td>&lt; 3 5</td>
<td>&lt; 3 28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3-6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3-6 5</td>
<td>3-6 6</td>
<td>3-6 19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7-12</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7-12 5</td>
<td>7-12 6</td>
<td>7-12 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12+</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12+ 3</td>
<td>12+ 7</td>
<td>12+ 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># years directly involved in identification of gifted students</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0 11</td>
<td>0 4</td>
<td>0 44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1 4</td>
<td>1 1</td>
<td>1 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2 2</td>
<td>2 3</td>
<td>2 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3-5</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>3-5 6</td>
<td>3-5 10</td>
<td>3-5 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6-10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6-10 5</td>
<td>6-10 2</td>
<td>6-10 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11+</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11+ 4</td>
<td>11+ 2</td>
<td>11+ 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># years at current school</td>
<td>&lt; 3 26</td>
<td>&lt; 3 5</td>
<td>&lt; 3 11</td>
<td>&lt; 3 5</td>
<td>&lt; 3 28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3-6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3-6 5</td>
<td>3-6 6</td>
<td>3-6 19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7-12</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7-12 5</td>
<td>7-12 6</td>
<td>7-12 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12+</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12+ 3</td>
<td>12+ 7</td>
<td>12+ 8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Appendix R. Qualifications and/or Training in Gifted Education

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Qualifications and/or Training in Gifted Education</th>
<th>Principals</th>
<th>Teachers</th>
<th>Overall Total</th>
<th>% of all respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No training, qualification or professional learning in gifted education</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single inservice or professional learning session in gifted education (Max 1.5 hours)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program of in-school professional learning in gifted education (between 2-15 hours)</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mini-certificate in gifted education (16 hours)</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Currently undertaking - Certificate in Gifted Education</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Certificate in Gifted Education (75 hours)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postgraduate in gifted education</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>135</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. Figures may not total exactly to 100% due to rounding. Where more than one was selected, the highest qualification or level of training has been used in this data.*
## Appendix S. Gagné and Nadeau Attitude Scale: Diocesan Principal Responses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey Q1 - Q34</th>
<th>Responses from Principals</th>
<th>n. 40</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Totally agree</td>
<td>Partially agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Our schools should offer special educational services for the gifted.</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>87.5%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. The best way to meet the needs of the gifted is to put them in special classes</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Children with difficulties have the most need of special educational services.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>47.5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Special programs for gifted children have the drawback of creating elitism.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Special educational services for the gifted are a mark of privilege.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7.5%</td>
<td>7.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. When the gifted are put in special classes, the other children feel devalued.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>22.5%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Most gifted children who skip a grade have difficulties in their social adjustment to a group of older students.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>32.5%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. It is more damaging for a gifted child to waste time in class than to adapt to skipping a grade.</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Gifted children are often bored in school.</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Children who skip a grade are usually pressured to do so by their parents.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. The gifted waste their time in regular classes.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statement</td>
<td>Totally agree</td>
<td>Partially agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. We have a greater moral responsibility to give special help to children with difficulties than to gifted children.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12.5%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Gifted persons are a valuable resource for our society.</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. The specific educational needs of the gifted are too often ignored in our schools.</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>7.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. The gifted need special attention in order to fully develop their talents.</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>97.5%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Our schools are already adequate in meeting the needs of the gifted.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>17.5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. I would very much like to be considered a gifted person.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>17.5%</td>
<td>32.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. It is parents who have the major responsibility for helping gifted children develop their talents.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>32.5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. A child who has been identified as gifted has more difficulty in making friends.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>17.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Gifted children should be left in regular classes, since they serve as an intellectual stimulant for the other children.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>32.5%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. By separating students into gifted and other groups, we increase the labelling of children as strong-weak, good-less good, etc</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>7.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. Some teachers feel their authority threatened by gifted children.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>72.5%</td>
<td>7.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. The gifted are already favoured in our schools.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7.5%</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. In order to progress, a society must develop the talents of gifted individuals to a maximum.</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>92.5%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statement</td>
<td>Totally agree</td>
<td>Partially agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. By offering special educational services to the gifted we prepare the future members of a dominant class</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. Tax-payers should not have to pay for special education for the minority of children who are gifted</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.5%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. Average children are the major resource of our society; so, they should be the focus of our attention.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7.5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. Gifted children might become vain or egotistical if they are given special attention.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7.5%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. When skipping a grade, gifted students miss important ideas (they have &quot;holes&quot; in their knowledge).</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. Since we invest supplementary funds for children with difficulties, we should do the same for the gifted.</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>97.5%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31. Often, gifted children are rejected because people are envious of them.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>22.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32. The regular school program stifles the intellectual curiosity of gifted children.</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33. The leaders of tomorrow's society will come mostly from the gifted of today.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>32.5%</td>
<td>17.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34. A greater number of gifted children should be allowed to skip a grade.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Appendix T. Gagné and Nadeau Attitude Scale: Diocesan Teacher Responses

### Survey Q1 - Q34

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Totally agree</th>
<th>Partially agree</th>
<th>Undecided</th>
<th>Partially disagree</th>
<th>Totally disagree</th>
<th>n. 135</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Our schools should offer special educational services for the gifted.</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td></td>
<td>8%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. The best way to meet the needs of the gifted is to put them in special classes</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td></td>
<td>52%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Children with difficulties have the most need of special educational services.</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td></td>
<td>47%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Special programs for gifted children have the drawback of creating elitism.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>33</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td></td>
<td>52%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Special educational services for the gifted are a mark of privilege.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>73</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td></td>
<td>78%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. When the gifted are put in special classes, the other children feel devalued.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>41</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td></td>
<td>61%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Most gifted children who skip a grade have difficulties in their social adjustment to a group of older students.</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td></td>
<td>33%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. It is more damaging for a gifted child to waste time in class than to adapt to skipping a grade.</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td></td>
<td>17%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Gifted children are often bored in school.</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td></td>
<td>20%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Children who skip a grade are usually pressured to do so by their parents.</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td></td>
<td>28%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. The gifted waste their time in regular classes.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>37</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td></td>
<td>68%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. We have a greater moral responsibility to give special help to children with difficulties than to gifted children.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totally agree</td>
<td>Partially agree</td>
<td>Undecided</td>
<td>Partially disagree</td>
<td>Totally disagree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>58</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>13. Gifted persons are a valuable resource for our society.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>96%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>14. The specific educational needs of the gifted are too often ignored in our schools.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>15. The gifted need special attention in order to fully develop their talents.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>93%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>16. Our schools are already adequate in meeting the needs of the gifted.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>17. I would very much like to be considered a gifted person.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>18. It is parents who have the major responsibility for helping gifted children develop their talents.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>19. A child who has been identified as gifted has more difficulty in making friends.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>20. Gifted children should be left in regular classes, since they serve as an intellectual stimulant for the other children.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>21. By separating students into gifted and other groups, we increase the labelling of children as strong-weak, good-less good, etc</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>22. Some teachers feel their authority threatened by gifted children.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>23. The gifted are already favoured in our schools.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>24. In order to progress, a society must develop the talents of gifted individuals to a maximum.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. By offering special educational services to the gifted we prepare the future members of a dominant class</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. Tax-payers should not have to pay for special education for the minority of children who are gifted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. Average children are the major resource of our society; so, they should be the focus of our attention.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. Gifted children might become vain or egotistical if they are given special attention.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. When skipping a grade, gifted students miss important ideas (they have &quot;holes&quot; in their knowledge).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. Since we invest supplementary funds for children with difficulties, we should do the same for the gifted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31. Often, gifted children are rejected because people are envious of them.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32. The regular school program stifles the intellectual curiosity of gifted children.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33. The leaders of tomorrow's society will come mostly from the gifted of today.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34. A greater number of gifted children should be allowed to skip a grade.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Appendix U. Gagné and Nadeau Attitude Scale: Principal Responses – Needs and Support

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimension - <em>Needs and Support</em></th>
<th>Responses from Principals</th>
<th>n. 40</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Totally agree</td>
<td>Partially agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Our schools should offer special educational services for the gifted.</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>87.5%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Gifted children are often bored in school.</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. The gifted waste their time in regular classes.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. The specific educational needs of the gifted are too often ignored in our schools.</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>7.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. The gifted need special attention in order to fully develop their talents.</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>97.5%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. In order to progress, a society must develop the talents of gifted individuals to a maximum.</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>92.5%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. Since we invest supplementary funds for children with difficulties, we should do the same for the gifted.</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>97.5%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32. The regular school program stifles the intellectual curiosity of gifted children.</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix V. Gagné and Nadeau Attitude Scale: Teacher Responses – Needs and Support

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimension - Needs and Support</th>
<th>Responses from Teachers n.135</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Totally agree</td>
<td>Partially agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Our schools should offer special educational services for the gifted.</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Gifted children are often bored in school.</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. The gifted waste their time in regular classes.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. The specific educational needs of the gifted are too often ignored in our schools.</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. The gifted need special attention in order to fully develop their talents.</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>93%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. In order to progress, a society must develop the talents of gifted individuals to a maximum.</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. Since we invest supplementary funds for children with difficulties, we should do the same for the gifted.</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>91%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32. The regular school program stifles the intellectual curiosity of gifted children.</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix W. Gagné and Nadeau Attitude Scale: Principal Responses – Resistance to Objections

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimension – Resistance to Objections</th>
<th>Responses from Principals</th>
<th>n. 40</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Totally agree</td>
<td>Partially agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Children with difficulties have the most need of special educational services.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>47.5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Special programs for gifted children have the drawback of creating elitism.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Special educational services for the gifted are a mark of privilege.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7.5%</td>
<td>7.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. We have a greater moral responsibility to give special help to children with difficulties than to gifted children.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12.5%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Our schools are already adequate in meeting the needs of the gifted.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>17.5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. It is parents who have the major responsibility for helping gifted children develop their talents.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>32.5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. The gifted are already favoured in our schools.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7.5%</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. Tax-payers should not have to pay for special education for the minority of children who are gifted</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.5%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. Average children are the major resource of our society; so, they should be the focus of our attention.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7.5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. Gifted children might become vain or egotistical if they are given special attention.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7.5%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Resistance to Objections

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimension</th>
<th>Responses from Teachers</th>
<th>n. 135</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3. Children with difficulties have the most need of special educational services.</td>
<td>Totally agree</td>
<td>Partially agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Special programs for gifted children have the drawback of creating elitism.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Special educational services for the gifted are a mark of privilege.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. We have a greater moral responsibility to give special help to children with difficulties than to gifted children.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Our schools are already adequate in meeting the needs of the gifted.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. It is parents who have the major responsibility for helping gifted children develop their talents.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. The gifted are already favoured in our schools.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. Tax-payers should not have to pay for special education for the minority of children who are gifted</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. Average children are the major resource of our society; so, they should be the focus of our attention.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. Gifted children might become vain or egotistical if they are given special attention.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix Y. Gagné and Nadeau Attitude Scale: Principal and Teacher Responses – Social Value

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimension - Social Value</th>
<th>Responses from Principals n. 40</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Totally agree</td>
<td>Partially agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Gifted persons are a valuable resource for our society.</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. I would very much like to be considered a gifted person.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. By offering special educational services to the gifted we prepare the future members of a dominant class</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33. The leaders of tomorrow's society will come mostly from the gifted of today.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimension - Social Value</th>
<th>Responses from Teachers n. 135</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Totally agree</td>
<td>Partially agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Gifted persons are a valuable resource for our society.</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. I would very much like to be considered a gifted person.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. By offering special educational services to the gifted we prepare the future members of a dominant class</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33. The leaders of tomorrow's society will come mostly from the gifted of today.</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Comparative Presentation of the Data - Attitudes of Principals and Teachers towards the Identification of Gifted Students

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items 1-14</th>
<th>Totally agree</th>
<th>Partially agree</th>
<th>Undecided</th>
<th>Partially disagree</th>
<th>Totally disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Diocesan schools should implement effective identification programs for the gifted</td>
<td>32 (80%)</td>
<td>84 (62%)</td>
<td>6 (15%)</td>
<td>37 (28%)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3 (10%)</td>
<td>1 (1%)</td>
<td>2 (1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. The best way to identify the needs of the gifted is to use multiple criteria and measures</td>
<td>33 (82.5%)</td>
<td>99 (73%)</td>
<td>3 (7.5%)</td>
<td>30 (22%)</td>
<td>2 (5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4 (10%)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1 (1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. It is more important to identify children with learning difficulties than it is to identify gifted students</td>
<td>2 (5%)</td>
<td>2 (1%)</td>
<td>6 (15%)</td>
<td>21 (16%)</td>
<td>4 (10%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11 (16%)</td>
<td>10 (8%)</td>
<td>39 (25%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>19 (29%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>62 (47.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Identifying gifted students has the danger of leading to elitism.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2 (1%)</td>
<td>3 (7.5%)</td>
<td>10 (7%)</td>
<td>18 (13%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10 (25%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>39 (29%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>26 (65%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>66 (49%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Most of the diocesan schools don’t have any gifted students.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>- (1%)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>8 (8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7.5 (10%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10 (92.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>81%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Identification enables a better match of program options for gifted students.</td>
<td>31 (77.5%)</td>
<td>99 (73%)</td>
<td>5 (12.5%)</td>
<td>30 (22%)</td>
<td>1 (1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 (2.5%)</td>
<td>2 (1%)</td>
<td>3 (7.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 (1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- (2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Items 1-14</td>
<td>Totally agree</td>
<td>Partially agree</td>
<td>Undecided</td>
<td>Partially disagree</td>
<td>Totally disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Diocesan schools adequately identify gifted students.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. I believe I am a gifted person, but have never been identified as one.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>7.5%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. It is parents’ responsibility, not schools, to ensure their gifted child is identified.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. By identifying the gifted, we create inequities amongst students.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Some teachers prefer gifted students not be identified.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>57.5%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Gifted students don’t need to be identified because they learn anyway.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. More funding and resources should be directed towards the identification of gifted students.</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>22.5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Items 1-14</td>
<td>Totally agree</td>
<td>Partially agree</td>
<td>Undecided</td>
<td>Partially disagree</td>
<td>Totally disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P  T</td>
<td>P  T</td>
<td>P  T</td>
<td>P  T</td>
<td>P  T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. There are numerous benefits in identifying gifted students.</td>
<td>32  96</td>
<td>6  33</td>
<td>-  4</td>
<td>-  -</td>
<td>2  2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>80%  71%</td>
<td>15%  24%</td>
<td>-  3%</td>
<td>-  -</td>
<td>5%  1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Scores were inverted for answers to items 3, 4, 5, 7, 9, 10 and 12 (italicized) which load negatively on the factor; to be interpreted on the continuum from a global positive attitude (high mean) to a global negative attitude (low mean).*
### Appendix AA. Identification Approaches and Practices in Schools

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Approach / Practice</th>
<th>Principals Frequency n. 40</th>
<th>% of total respondents</th>
<th>Teachers Frequency n. 135</th>
<th>% of total respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Timing (the ‘When’)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ID1</td>
<td>Identification usually occurs at the beginning of each school year</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>27.5%</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ID2</td>
<td>Identification is part of our enrolment process</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>57.5%</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ID3</td>
<td>Identification occurs throughout the student’s learning experiences each year</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>82%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ID4</td>
<td>Identification occurs at specific points in time each year</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ID6</td>
<td>Identification is an ongoing process at our school</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Measures (the ‘What’)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ID5</td>
<td>Pre-testing is also used as a tool for identification</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>67.5%</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ID7</td>
<td>Identification practices and procedures are documented in our school policies and/or other school documentation</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>62.5%</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ID9</td>
<td>Subjective measures such as structured observations of the student are used in the identification of gifted students</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ID10</td>
<td>Teacher nomination is used in the identification of gifted students</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>92.5%</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>91%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ID11</td>
<td>Parent nomination is used in the identification of gifted students</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ID12</td>
<td>Peer nomination is used in the identification of gifted students</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ID13</td>
<td>Self nomination is used in the identification of gifted students</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ID14</td>
<td>Student files of previous records and reports are used</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Code</td>
<td>Approach / Practice</td>
<td>Principals Frequency n. 40</td>
<td>% of total respondents</td>
<td>Teachers Frequency n. 135</td>
<td>% of total respondents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>in the identification of gifted students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ID15</td>
<td>Objective measures such as standardised tests of ability or achievement are used in the identification of gifted students</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>87.5%</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>79%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ID16</td>
<td>Off-level, or above-level testing, is used in the identification of gifted students</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>67.5%</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ID17</td>
<td>IQ tests and other forms of psychometric testing are used in the identification of gifted students</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>82.5%</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>72%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ID18</td>
<td>Both objective and subjective measures of identification are used to provide evidence in the identification of gifted students</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>77.5%</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Purpose</strong> (the ‘Why’)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ID8</td>
<td>Identification is seen as having a diagnostic purpose</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ID19</td>
<td>Identification involves gathering evidence of a students’ ability (potential), regardless of their current level of performance</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ID20</td>
<td>We employ identification procedures which are designed to find students who are not achieving at levels commensurate with their ability</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>42.5%</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ID21</td>
<td>The main purpose of identification of gifted students is to help teachers know who falls within the gifted range</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7.5%</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ID22</td>
<td>The main purpose of identification of gifted students is to gather information that initiates appropriate curriculum and programs for gifted students</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>87.5%</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>83%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Code</td>
<td>Approach / Practice</td>
<td>Principals Frequency n. 40</td>
<td>% of total respondents</td>
<td>Teachers Frequency n. 135</td>
<td>% of total respondents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ID23</td>
<td>Underachievement in gifted learners has been identified as a challenging issue</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>57%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Appendix BB. Principal Self-assessment of Knowledge Adequacy - Diocesan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School Code</th>
<th>Self-perception of adequacy levels of knowledge about identification</th>
<th>% of identified gifted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>comprehensive / extensive</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>comprehensive / extensive</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>comprehensive / extensive</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>comprehensive / extensive</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>adequate</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>adequate</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>adequate</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>adequate</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>adequate</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>adequate</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>adequate</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>adequate</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>adequate</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>adequate</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>adequate</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>adequate</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>adequate</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>adequate</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>adequate</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>adequate</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>adequate</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>adequate</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>adequate</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>adequate</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>adequate</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>sometimes adequate / sometimes inadequate</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>sometimes adequate / sometimes inadequate</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>sometimes adequate / sometimes inadequate</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>sometimes adequate / sometimes inadequate</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Status</td>
<td>Value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>sometimes adequate / sometimes inadequate</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>sometimes adequate / sometimes inadequate</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>sometimes adequate / sometimes inadequate</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>sometimes adequate / sometimes inadequate</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>sometimes adequate / sometimes inadequate</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>sometimes adequate / sometimes inadequate</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>sometimes adequate / sometimes inadequate</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>sometimes adequate / sometimes inadequate</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>sometimes adequate / sometimes inadequate</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>sometimes adequate / sometimes inadequate</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>sometimes adequate / sometimes inadequate</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Appendix CC. Comparative Data: Principals’ Qualifications, Attitudes and Prevalence of Identified Gifted

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Current school enrolment</th>
<th>Formal qualifications and/or training in gifted education</th>
<th>Attitude Description based on Gagné &amp; Nadeau Scale</th>
<th>Number of students formally identified as gifted</th>
<th>% of enrolment identified gifted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>198</td>
<td>Postgraduate in gifted ed</td>
<td>positive</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>254</td>
<td>Certificate in gifted ed</td>
<td>positive</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>167</td>
<td>Certificate in gifted ed</td>
<td>very positive</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>323</td>
<td>Certificate in gifted ed</td>
<td>very positive</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>193</td>
<td>Certificate in gifted ed</td>
<td>positive</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>416</td>
<td>Certificate in gifted ed</td>
<td>positive</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>182</td>
<td>Certificate in gifted ed</td>
<td>very positive</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>210</td>
<td>Certificate in gifted ed</td>
<td>positive</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>215</td>
<td>Mini-certificate in gifted ed</td>
<td>positive</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>203</td>
<td>Mini-certificate in gifted ed</td>
<td>ambivalent</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>184</td>
<td>Mini-certificate in gifted ed</td>
<td>positive</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>258</td>
<td>Mini-certificate in gifted ed</td>
<td>positive</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>365</td>
<td>Mini-certificate in gifted ed</td>
<td>positive</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>721</td>
<td>Mini-certificate in gifted ed</td>
<td>ambivalent</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>360</td>
<td>Mini-certificate in gifted ed</td>
<td>positive</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>201</td>
<td>Mini-certificate in gifted ed</td>
<td>positive</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>180</td>
<td>Mini-certificate in gifted ed</td>
<td>ambivalent</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>823</td>
<td>Mini-certificate in gifted ed</td>
<td>positive</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>440</td>
<td>Mini-certificate in gifted ed</td>
<td>ambivalent</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>198</td>
<td>Mini-certificate in gifted ed</td>
<td>positive</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>511</td>
<td>Mini-certificate in gifted ed</td>
<td>positive</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>503</td>
<td>Mini-certificate in gifted ed</td>
<td>very positive</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>657</td>
<td>Mini-certificate in gifted ed</td>
<td>positive</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Code</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Attitude</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>130</td>
<td>No training, qualification or PL</td>
<td>positive</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>760</td>
<td>No training, qualification or PL</td>
<td>ambivalent</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>370</td>
<td>No training, qualification or PL</td>
<td>ambivalent</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>311</td>
<td>presently studying</td>
<td>positive</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>154</td>
<td>Program of in-school PL</td>
<td>positive</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>332</td>
<td>Program of in-school PL</td>
<td>ambivalent</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>415</td>
<td>Program of in-school PL</td>
<td>ambivalent</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>228</td>
<td>Program of in-school PL</td>
<td>positive</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>160</td>
<td>Program of in-school PL</td>
<td>ambivalent</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>581</td>
<td>Program of in-school PL</td>
<td>positive</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>425</td>
<td>Program of in-school PL</td>
<td>positive</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>504</td>
<td>Program of in-school PL</td>
<td>positive</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>175</td>
<td>Program of in-school PL</td>
<td>ambivalent</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>300</td>
<td>Program of in-school PL</td>
<td>positive</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>299</td>
<td>Program of in-school PL</td>
<td>positive</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>403</td>
<td>Single inservice</td>
<td>ambivalent</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>235</td>
<td>Single inservice</td>
<td>ambivalent</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix DD. Emerging Questions EQ5 – EQ14 (Phase 1 findings)

EQ5 What are the knowledge characteristics of principals and teachers who are effective in supporting the identification of giftedness in students?

EQ6 Do conceptions of giftedness held by teachers and principals in schools with high prevalence of identified giftedness differ to those in schools with low prevalence of identified giftedness?

EQ7 Are teacher and principal attitudes towards the gifted, and the flow-on effect on identification, different in schools successful and not successful in high giftedness recognition?

EQ8 What are the reasons for ambivalent / negative attitudes of teachers and principals towards the gifted and their education, yet positive attitudes towards the identification of the gifted?

EQ9 What are the reasons identification is such an unfamiliar phenomenon for these teachers?

EQ10 Is there a link between teacher attitudes, training, and experiences in identification and rates of identification of giftedness?

EQ11 What are the links, if any, between the schools’ approach to identification and range of practices in use, and effective identification?

EQ12 Where identification is effectively occurring, who takes responsibility for identification in the school, and what are some processes that make it successful?

EQ13 What underpins and supports early identification in schools?

EQ14 What tools and measures are being utilised by schools effective in identification, and what differentiates these from assessments used by those schools that were less successful in identification?
## Appendix EE. Contextual and Demographic Features: Six Sites within the Case Study

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>05</th>
<th>012</th>
<th>021</th>
<th>04</th>
<th>015</th>
<th>026</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Enrolment</strong></td>
<td>169</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>193</td>
<td>254</td>
<td>332</td>
<td>721</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Prevalence of gifted students</strong></td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ICSEA</strong></td>
<td>Above average</td>
<td>Well above average</td>
<td>Slightly above average</td>
<td>Well below average</td>
<td>Above average</td>
<td>Slightly above average</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>LBOTE</strong></td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>94%</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>93%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Attendance rates - average</strong></td>
<td>96%</td>
<td>96%</td>
<td>96%</td>
<td>97%</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>95%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong># teaching staff</strong></td>
<td>7 f/t 10 p/t</td>
<td>7 f/t 12 p/t</td>
<td>7 f/t 9 p/t</td>
<td>18 f/t 5 p/t</td>
<td>11 f/t 12 p/t</td>
<td>36 f/t 9 p/t</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Person responsible for gifted education</strong></td>
<td>Principal (05P)</td>
<td>Gifted Education Coordinator (012a)</td>
<td>Gifted Education Coordinator (021d)</td>
<td>Coordinator (04a)</td>
<td>Assistant Principal (015b)</td>
<td>Diverse Learning Coordinator (026c)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Appendix FF. Self-assessment of Knowledge Adequacy - Principals and Teachers – Case Study

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Self-rated Knowledge about Identification</th>
<th>Comprehensive/extensive</th>
<th>Adequate</th>
<th>Sometimes adequate/sometimes inadequate</th>
<th>Somewhat inadequate</th>
<th>Minimal/very limited</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Schools successful in identification n.18</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05 n.6</td>
<td>* Principal</td>
<td>2 teachers</td>
<td>2 teachers</td>
<td>1 teacher</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>012 n.7</td>
<td>* GE Coordinator</td>
<td>1 teacher</td>
<td>Principal 1 teacher</td>
<td>3 teachers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>021 n.5</td>
<td>* GE Coordinator</td>
<td>Principal 3 teachers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Schools least successful in identification n.33</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04 n.9</td>
<td>Principal * Coordinator 1 teacher</td>
<td>2 teachers</td>
<td>4 teachers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>015 n.9</td>
<td>* AP</td>
<td>Principal 6 teachers</td>
<td>1 teacher</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>026 n.15</td>
<td>1 Coordinator</td>
<td>Principal 1 teacher</td>
<td>6 teachers</td>
<td>4 teachers * Diverse Learning Coordinator</td>
<td>1 teacher</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. * denotes the person leading gifted education in the school.
Appendix GG. Sample of Data Coded for School Identification Practices (using NVivo 11)

Name: Identification Practices
Coding Description: Experience an identification
Sites: Non-Successful Schools

Reference 1 - 0.06% Coverage
Interviewee: No.

Reference 1 - 1.13% Coverage
Interviewee: Yes. In - I've done it in two schools where the identification process thing, there were some in place but they were loose. So they needed tightening up. They needed to be accurate identification, not just hunches because some schools - I've been in some schools where the schools rely on just a Raven's as an identifier. That just isn't good enough. So making sure, putting it in policy so it becomes a standard practice. So yes, I've done that twice, in two schools now.

Reference 1 - 1.45% Coverage
Interviewee: I've never been the Gifted and Talented Co-ordinator but I've had an interest in gifted and talented. I have worked with the former AP who was here in setting up a new identification program to what we previously had and I have done some testing.

Reference 1 - 0.43% Coverage
Interviewee: No, not for myself, no. I've heard [unclear] myself actually implementing it, no.
Interviewee: Yes, I have. I've actually worked with colleagues this term, our AP has, obviously, moved on so I've had to step in. There was one there that I've just had to revise for this term - semester so it was quite a valuable thing that I was able to do this term.

Interviewee: No.

Interviewee: Not - probably not a formalised program.

Facilitator: Well, it's about an identification program.

Interviewee: Yeah, no, no.

Interviewee: Yeah I've implemented strategies in my classroom last year in order to cater for this child but I haven't done anything like a pulse score. I just pretty much was like a normal teacher, like you cater for your special needs and you cater for your gifted and talented, and you implement activities to suit these children that's where I'm at.
Interviewee: Okay, yeah. So the way we do it now is as I have explained, that we have identification process that involves teachers, parents, formalised testing, and then an IEP for the students who come out in the percentile ranges that we've identified as being gifted.

Reference 1 - 2.67% Coverage

Interviewee: While as Coordinator people refer students through me. I then refer them onto G and T specialist staff. I don't do the testing but I facilitate the movement of students put forward through the processes.

Reference 1 - 1.25% Coverage

Interviewee: I filled in for the person who was running the Enrichment Program for a month or so, but I didn't do much of the identification at all. I just took the groups that she had already set up and implemented. But I did see what she would do to assess the children and the different things like that.

Facilitator: Familiarity with the tools?

Interviewee: It was a while ago, but yeah.

Reference 1 - 4.47% Coverage

Interviewee: Yes. When I went - came into the role I looked at the G&T policy and looked at what we currently do to identify children and how do we put in the processes. But finding that it was a very hit and miss situation. What we have done last year, and what we're looking at this year, is I actually have another teacher who's going on some G&T professional development focussed around how to identify G&T students. We're working on a project at the moment as to how we can do that better and I think we've got a few ideas.

Yes, we will rely on some teachers identifying students who are performing above the age of the other children in the class, but then we also do at school some assessments that are done across the school so we call things like PAT maths and some reading comprehension assessments. Now, these assessments are academic assessments that we've bought, so they are standardised assessments. We can actually have a look at those assessments and for the whole school we can actually look at those results and start to identify who potentially is working above their age level.
That's something we've never done before. We're looking at how we can use those results, from a whole school to identify potentially gifted students because we do those academic assessments twice a year and we can look at the growth of children. We can look at who's outperforming children in their class and then we can look at how they're performing in class and what we could do to support their needs. We're starting to be more of a holistic approach, as well as the teachers identifying children in their class, but that's something that we're developing this year and hopefully next year we will look at how we can implement that.

Interviewee: Have I ever been in charge - no I haven't.

Interviewee: No.

Interviewee: No, not as yet. I'm doing a little bit about gifted education through the CEO, Leading Gifted Education...

Interviewee: No.
Interviewee: No, I haven't.

Interviewee: No, I haven't.

Interviewee: Yeah S - oh like it's a - well it's not hyphenated, just two words, yeah. Well I guess because I've helped to identify her…

Interviewee: Only as an executive member. I didn't have - I mentored the G and T teacher. So they - I myself didn't have training in Raven's or [Coolibah] but they did. So when they went into year three, that's where we targeted mainly, they brought back the data to me and then we put in school structures.

Interviewee: Not me being responsible, no. I have differentiated in my classroom if that's what that means. I haven't actually implemented a program for the whole school.
Interviewee: No I have not.

Interviewee: I'm in the process of doing it now but never before this, no.

Interviewee: An identification program? No, I have not - haven't been a part of...

Interviewee: No, I haven't.

Yeah, it was a long time ago. Must have been 20 years ago, when there was a push for it. As I said, it comes around regularly. We had to identify - there was a checklist.

Facilitator: That's the list you referred to earlier? Or is that...

Female 1: It was one of those...

Facilitator: ...is that another one?

Female 1: ...sorts of things. There was - from what I - from memory, there was the two columns, the bright child and the gifted child. Then we had - there was a little question thing at the back, and you had to see if anyone fitted into that model.

Facilitator: In terms of a formal identification that you've worked on in a class or a school, so that would be on that...

Female 1: It was at this school, yeah. But as I said, it - we do it for a couple of years. Or someone's interested in it and then that person might move on and the project falls apart.
I haven't been responsible for it, but I have been part of carrying it out. We have an enrichment program that, at the beginning of each year, there's an identification pack that's given out to each teacher. It just gives you signs and things to look for, and all of that. Then once - if you identify a child that meets any of that criteria, you can go to the person, who runs the G&TE and enrichment. Just have that - and have that discussion. So it's just been - I've really just been part of carrying it out.
### Appendix HH. Gagné and Nadeau Attitude Scale: Schools Successful in Identification

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Position currently held in the school</th>
<th>Mean on attitude scale</th>
<th>Descriptor</th>
<th>Diocesan Means</th>
<th>Diocesan Descriptor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>05b</td>
<td>Kindergarten teacher</td>
<td>3.27</td>
<td>positive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05a</td>
<td>Year 1 teacher</td>
<td>3.15</td>
<td>ambivalent</td>
<td>3.02</td>
<td>Ambivalent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05c</td>
<td>Year 2 teacher</td>
<td>3.09</td>
<td>ambivalent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05d</td>
<td>Religious Education Coordinator</td>
<td>3.44</td>
<td>positive</td>
<td>3.18</td>
<td>Ambivalent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05e</td>
<td>Assistant Principal</td>
<td>3.12</td>
<td>ambivalent</td>
<td>3.36</td>
<td>Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05P</td>
<td>Principal</td>
<td>4.24</td>
<td>very positive</td>
<td>3.44</td>
<td>Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12c</td>
<td>Kindergarten Teacher</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>ambivalent</td>
<td>3.02</td>
<td>Ambivalent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12f</td>
<td>Year 1 teacher</td>
<td>3.03</td>
<td>ambivalent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12b</td>
<td>Year 2 teacher</td>
<td>2.76</td>
<td>ambivalent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12a</td>
<td>Gifted Education Coordinator</td>
<td>3.82</td>
<td>positive</td>
<td>3.18</td>
<td>Ambivalent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12e</td>
<td>Religious Education Coordinator</td>
<td>2.29</td>
<td>negative</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12d</td>
<td>Assistant Principal</td>
<td>3.53</td>
<td>positive</td>
<td>3.36</td>
<td>Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12P</td>
<td>Principal</td>
<td>3.06</td>
<td>ambivalent</td>
<td>3.44</td>
<td>Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21b</td>
<td>Year 2 teacher</td>
<td>2.62</td>
<td>negative</td>
<td>3.02</td>
<td>Ambivalent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21d</td>
<td>Gifted Education Coordinator</td>
<td>3.29</td>
<td>positive</td>
<td>3.18</td>
<td>Ambivalent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21c</td>
<td>Religious Education Coordinator</td>
<td>3.09</td>
<td>ambivalent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21a</td>
<td>Assistant Principal, Year 1 teacher</td>
<td>3.18</td>
<td>ambivalent</td>
<td>3.36</td>
<td>Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21P</td>
<td>Principal</td>
<td>3.41</td>
<td>positive</td>
<td>3.44</td>
<td>Positive</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix II. Gagné and Nadeau Attitude Scale: Schools Not Successful in Identification

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Position currently held in the school</th>
<th>Mean on attitude scale</th>
<th>Descriptor</th>
<th>Diocesan Means</th>
<th>Diocesan Descriptor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4e</td>
<td>Kindergarten Teacher</td>
<td>3.91</td>
<td>positive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4b</td>
<td>Kindergarten Teacher</td>
<td>2.74</td>
<td>negative</td>
<td>3.02</td>
<td>Ambivalent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4c</td>
<td>Year 2 teacher</td>
<td>2.74</td>
<td>negative</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4f</td>
<td>Year 2 teacher</td>
<td>2.56</td>
<td>negative</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4a</td>
<td>Coordinator / Key Reference Person &amp; Stage 2 teacher</td>
<td>2.85</td>
<td>ambivalent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4h</td>
<td>Coordinator</td>
<td>2.82</td>
<td>ambivalent</td>
<td>3.18</td>
<td>Ambivalent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4d</td>
<td>Religious Education Coordinator &amp; Year 1 teacher</td>
<td>2.71</td>
<td>negative</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4g</td>
<td>Assistant Principal</td>
<td>3.88</td>
<td>positive</td>
<td>3.36</td>
<td>Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4P</td>
<td>Principal</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>positive</td>
<td>3.44</td>
<td>Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15g</td>
<td>Kindergarten teacher</td>
<td>3.29</td>
<td>positive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15h</td>
<td>Kindergarten teacher</td>
<td>3.29</td>
<td>positive</td>
<td>3.02</td>
<td>Ambivalent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15d</td>
<td>Year 1 teacher</td>
<td>2.29</td>
<td>negative</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15a</td>
<td>Year 2 teacher</td>
<td>3.59</td>
<td>positive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15c</td>
<td>Teacher Librarian</td>
<td>2.94</td>
<td>ambivalent</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15e</td>
<td>Coordinator</td>
<td>2.94</td>
<td>ambivalent</td>
<td>3.18</td>
<td>Ambivalent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15f</td>
<td>Coordinator</td>
<td>2.35</td>
<td>negative</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15b</td>
<td>AP, Gifted Education Coordinator , Year 2 teacher</td>
<td>3.44</td>
<td>positive</td>
<td>3.36</td>
<td>Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15P</td>
<td>Principal</td>
<td>2.94</td>
<td>ambivalent</td>
<td>3.44</td>
<td>Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26b</td>
<td>Kindergarten teacher</td>
<td>2.91</td>
<td>ambivalent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26n</td>
<td>Kindergarten teacher</td>
<td>2.94</td>
<td>ambivalent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26m</td>
<td>Kindergarten teacher</td>
<td>2.97</td>
<td>ambivalent</td>
<td>3.02</td>
<td>Ambivalent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26i</td>
<td>Year 1 teacher</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>negative</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26g</td>
<td>Year 1 teacher</td>
<td>2.35</td>
<td>negative</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26e</td>
<td>Year 1 teacher</td>
<td>2.76</td>
<td>ambivalent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Code</td>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Score</td>
<td>Rating</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26h</td>
<td>Year 1 teacher</td>
<td>2.76</td>
<td>ambivalent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26f</td>
<td>Year 2 teacher</td>
<td>3.35</td>
<td>positive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26j</td>
<td>Year 2 teacher</td>
<td>2.94</td>
<td>ambivalent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26k</td>
<td>Year 2 teacher</td>
<td>2.88</td>
<td>ambivalent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26c</td>
<td>Diverse Learning Coordinator &amp; Year 2 teacher</td>
<td>3.38</td>
<td>positive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26d</td>
<td>Coordinator &amp; Kindergarten teacher</td>
<td>2.88</td>
<td>ambivalent</td>
<td>3.18</td>
<td>Ambivalent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26a</td>
<td>Coordinator</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>positive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26l</td>
<td>Assistant Principal</td>
<td>3.06</td>
<td>ambivalent</td>
<td>3.36</td>
<td>Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26P</td>
<td>Principal</td>
<td>3.03</td>
<td>ambivalent</td>
<td>3.44</td>
<td>Positive</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Appendix JJ. Successful Identifying Schools’ Means: Responses to Identification of Gifted Students

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items 1-14</th>
<th>School 05</th>
<th>School 012</th>
<th>School 021</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Principal n.1</td>
<td>Teachers n.5</td>
<td>Principal n.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Knowledge / Experience</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. The best way to identify the needs of the gifted is to use multiple criteria and measures.</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>4.80</td>
<td>5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Most of the diocesan schools don’t have any gifted students.</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Identification enables a better match of program options for gifted students.</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Diocesan schools adequately identify gifted students.</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>2.80</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Gifted students don’t need to be identified because they learn anyway.</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. There are numerous benefits in identifying gifted students.</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Items 1-14</td>
<td>School 05 Principal n.1</td>
<td>Teachers n.5</td>
<td>School 012 Principal n.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Attitudes</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Diocesan schools should implement effective identification programs for</td>
<td><strong>5.00</strong></td>
<td><strong>5.00</strong></td>
<td><strong>5.00</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the gifted</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. It is more important to identify children with learning difficulties</td>
<td><strong>5.00</strong></td>
<td><strong>4.60</strong></td>
<td><strong>5.00</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>than it is to identify gifted students.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Identifying gifted students has the danger of leading to elitism.</td>
<td><strong>5.00</strong></td>
<td><strong>4.20</strong></td>
<td><strong>5.00</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. I believe I am a gifted person, but have never been identified as one.</td>
<td><strong>2.00</strong></td>
<td><strong>1.40</strong></td>
<td><strong>1.00</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. It is parents’ responsibility, not schools, to ensure their gifted</td>
<td><strong>5.00</strong></td>
<td><strong>4.40</strong></td>
<td><strong>5.00</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>child is identified.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. By identifying the gifted, we create inequities amongst students.</td>
<td><strong>5.00</strong></td>
<td><strong>3.40</strong></td>
<td><strong>5.00</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Some teachers prefer gifted students not be identified.</td>
<td><strong>4.00</strong></td>
<td><strong>2.20</strong></td>
<td><strong>1.00</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. More funding and resources should be directed towards the identification of gifted students.</td>
<td><strong>5.00</strong></td>
<td><strong>4.40</strong></td>
<td><strong>5.00</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Scores were inverted for answers to items 3, 4, 5, 7, 9, 10 and 12 which load negatively on the factor; to be interpreted on the continuum from a global positive attitude (high mean) to a global negative attitude (low mean).*
Appendix KK. Non-Successful Identifying Schools’ Means: Responses to Identification of Gifted Students

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items 1 - 14</th>
<th>School 04 Principal n.1</th>
<th>Teachers n.8</th>
<th>School 015 Principal n.1</th>
<th>Teachers n.8</th>
<th>School 026 Principal n.1</th>
<th>Teachers n.14</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Knowledge / Experience</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. The best way to identify the needs of the gifted is to use multiple criteria and measures.</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>4.38</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>4.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Most of the diocesan schools don’t have any gifted students.</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>3.38</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>4.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Identification enables a better match of program options for gifted students.</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>4.25</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>4.75</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>4.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Diocesan schools adequately identify gifted students.</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>2.38</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>3.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Gifted students don’t need to be identified because they learn anyway.</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>4.38</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>4.88</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>4.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. There are numerous benefits in identifying gifted students.</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>3.88</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>4.75</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>4.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Items 1 - 14</td>
<td>School 04 Principal n.1</td>
<td>Teachers n.8</td>
<td>School 015 Principal n.1</td>
<td>Teachers n.8</td>
<td>School 026 Principal n.1</td>
<td>Teachers n.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Attitudes</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Diocesan schools should implement effective identification programs for the gifted</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>4.13</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>4.75</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>4.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. It is more important to identify children with learning difficulties than it is to identify gifted students.</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>3.63</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>4.50</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>3.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Identifying gifted students has the danger of leading to elitism.</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>3.88</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. I believe I am a gifted person, but have never been identified as one.</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.38</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. It is parents’ responsibility, not schools, to ensure their gifted child is identified.</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>3.38</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>4.50</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>4.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. By identifying the gifted, we create inequities amongst students.</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>4.63</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>4.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Some teachers prefer gifted students not be identified.</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>3.13</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>2.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Items 1 - 14</td>
<td>School 04 Principal n.1</td>
<td>Teachers n.8</td>
<td>School 015 Principal n.1</td>
<td>Teachers n.8</td>
<td>School 026 Principal n.1</td>
<td>Teachers n.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. More funding and resources should be directed towards the identification of gifted students.</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>4.63</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>4.14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Scores were inverted for answers to items 3, 4, 5, 7, 9, 10 and 12 which load negatively on the factor; to be interpreted on the continuum from a global positive attitude (high mean) to a global negative attitude (low mean)
## Appendix LL. Attitudes Towards the Gifted and their Education, and Identification: Case study schools successful in identification

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Position currently held in the school</th>
<th>Descriptor – attitude towards the gifted and their education</th>
<th>Attitudes (self-rated) about Identification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>05b</td>
<td>Kindergarten teacher</td>
<td>positive</td>
<td>very positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05a</td>
<td>Year 1 teacher</td>
<td>ambivalent</td>
<td>positive / supportive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05c</td>
<td>Year 2 teacher</td>
<td>ambivalent</td>
<td>positive / supportive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05d</td>
<td>Religious Education Coordinator</td>
<td>positive</td>
<td>positive / supportive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05e</td>
<td>Assistant Principal</td>
<td>ambivalent</td>
<td>very positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05P</td>
<td>Principal</td>
<td>very positive</td>
<td>very positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12c</td>
<td>Kindergarten Teacher</td>
<td>ambivalent</td>
<td>very positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12f</td>
<td>Year 1 teacher</td>
<td>ambivalent</td>
<td>very positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12b</td>
<td>Year 2 teacher</td>
<td>ambivalent</td>
<td>positive / supportive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12a</td>
<td>Gifted Education Coordinator</td>
<td>positive</td>
<td>very positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12e</td>
<td>Religious Education Coordinator</td>
<td>negative</td>
<td>very positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12d</td>
<td>Assistant Principal</td>
<td>positive</td>
<td>positive / supportive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12P</td>
<td>Principal</td>
<td>ambivalent</td>
<td>positive / supportive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21b</td>
<td>Year 2 teacher</td>
<td>negative</td>
<td>positive / supportive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21d</td>
<td>Gifted Education Coordinator</td>
<td>positive</td>
<td>very positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21c</td>
<td>Religious Education Coordinator</td>
<td>ambivalent</td>
<td>positive / supportive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21a</td>
<td>Assistant Principal, Year 1 teacher</td>
<td>ambivalent</td>
<td>positive / supportive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21P</td>
<td>Principal</td>
<td>positive</td>
<td>positive / supportive</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Appendix MM. Attitudes Towards the Gifted and their Education, and Identification: Case study schools less successful in identification

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Position currently held in the school</th>
<th>Descriptor – attitude towards the gifted and their education</th>
<th>Attitudes (self-rated) about Identification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4e</td>
<td>Kindergarten Teacher</td>
<td>positive</td>
<td>very positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4b</td>
<td>Kindergarten Teacher</td>
<td>negative</td>
<td>positive / supportive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4c</td>
<td>Year 2 teacher</td>
<td>negative</td>
<td>negative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4f</td>
<td>Year 2 teacher</td>
<td>negative</td>
<td>positive / supportive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4a</td>
<td>Coordinator / Key Reference Person &amp; Stage 2 teacher</td>
<td>ambivalent</td>
<td>positive / supportive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4h</td>
<td>Coordinator</td>
<td>ambivalent</td>
<td>very positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4d</td>
<td>Religious Education Coordinator &amp; Year 1 teacher</td>
<td>negative</td>
<td>positive / supportive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4g</td>
<td>Assistant Principal</td>
<td>positive</td>
<td>positive / supportive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4P</td>
<td>Principal</td>
<td>positive</td>
<td>positive / supportive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15g</td>
<td>Kindergarten teacher</td>
<td>positive</td>
<td>positive / supportive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15h</td>
<td>Kindergarten teacher</td>
<td>positive</td>
<td>positive / supportive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15d</td>
<td>Year 1 teacher</td>
<td>negative</td>
<td>positive / supportive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15a</td>
<td>Year 2 teacher</td>
<td>positive</td>
<td>very positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15c</td>
<td>Teacher Librarian</td>
<td>ambivalent</td>
<td>positive / supportive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15e</td>
<td>Coordinator</td>
<td>ambivalent</td>
<td>very positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15f</td>
<td>Coordinator</td>
<td>negative</td>
<td>positive / supportive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15b</td>
<td>AP, Gifted Education Coordinator, Year 2 teacher</td>
<td>positive</td>
<td>very positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15P</td>
<td>Principal</td>
<td>ambivalent</td>
<td>very positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26b</td>
<td>Kindergarten teacher</td>
<td>ambivalent</td>
<td>positive / supportive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26n</td>
<td>Kindergarten teacher</td>
<td>ambivalent</td>
<td>positive / supportive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26m</td>
<td>Kindergarten teacher</td>
<td>ambivalent</td>
<td>very positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26i</td>
<td>Year 1 teacher</td>
<td>negative</td>
<td>ambivalent / indifferent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26g</td>
<td>Year 1 teacher</td>
<td>negative</td>
<td>positive / supportive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Code</td>
<td>Position currently held in the school</td>
<td>Descriptor – attitude towards the gifted and their education</td>
<td>Attitudes (self-rated) about Identification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26e</td>
<td>Year 1 teacher</td>
<td>ambivalent</td>
<td>ambivalent / indifferent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26h</td>
<td>Year 1 teacher</td>
<td>ambivalent</td>
<td>very positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26f</td>
<td>Year 2 teacher</td>
<td>positive</td>
<td>very positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26j</td>
<td>Year 2 teacher</td>
<td>ambivalent</td>
<td>very positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26k</td>
<td>Year 2 teacher</td>
<td>ambivalent</td>
<td>positive / supportive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26c</td>
<td>Diverse Learning Coordinator &amp; Year 2 teacher</td>
<td>positive</td>
<td>negative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26d</td>
<td>Coordinator &amp; Kindergarten teacher</td>
<td>ambivalent</td>
<td>positive / supportive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26a</td>
<td>Coordinator</td>
<td>positive</td>
<td>very positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26l</td>
<td>Assistant Principal</td>
<td>ambivalent</td>
<td>positive / supportive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26P</td>
<td>Principal</td>
<td>ambivalent</td>
<td>positive / supportive</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix NN. Case Study teachers: Qualifications, Attitudes, Experiences and Prevalence

### Schools successful in identification

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School Code</th>
<th>Formal qualifications and/or training in gifted education</th>
<th>Attitude Description - Gagné &amp; Nadeau Scale</th>
<th>Years directly involved in identification</th>
<th>Personal experiences with identifying giftedness</th>
<th>% of identified gifted in school</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5e</td>
<td>Mini-cert in gifted ed</td>
<td>ambivalent</td>
<td>11+</td>
<td>family member</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5b</td>
<td>Program of in-school PL</td>
<td>positive</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>family member, friend</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5d</td>
<td>Program of in-school PL</td>
<td>positive</td>
<td>3-5yrs</td>
<td>Little or none</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5a</td>
<td>Single inservice</td>
<td>ambivalent</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Little or none</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5c</td>
<td>No training</td>
<td>ambivalent</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Little or none</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12a</td>
<td>Certificate in gifted ed</td>
<td>positive</td>
<td>6-10yrs</td>
<td>Little or none</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12d</td>
<td>Mini-cert in gifted ed</td>
<td>positive</td>
<td>3-5yrs</td>
<td>friend</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12c</td>
<td>Program of in-school PL</td>
<td>ambivalent</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Little or none</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12e</td>
<td>Single inservice</td>
<td>negative</td>
<td>3-5yrs</td>
<td>Little or none</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12b</td>
<td>No training</td>
<td>ambivalent</td>
<td>3-5yrs</td>
<td>Little or none</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12f</td>
<td>No training</td>
<td>ambivalent</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Little or none</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21d</td>
<td>Program of in-school PL</td>
<td>positive</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>family member</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21c</td>
<td>Single inservice</td>
<td>ambivalent</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>family member</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21a</td>
<td>Single inservice</td>
<td>ambivalent</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Little or none</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21b</td>
<td>No training</td>
<td>negative</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Little or none</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Schools least successful in identification

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School Code</th>
<th>Formal qualifications and/or training in gifted education</th>
<th>Attitude Description - Gagné &amp; Nadeau Scale</th>
<th>Years directly involved in identification</th>
<th>Personal experiences with identifying giftedness</th>
<th>% of identified gifted in school</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4a</td>
<td>Mini-cert in gifted ed</td>
<td>ambivalent</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>family member</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4g</td>
<td>Mini-cert in gifted ed</td>
<td>positive</td>
<td>6-10yrs</td>
<td>Little or none</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4d</td>
<td>Program of in-school PL</td>
<td>negative</td>
<td>6-10yrs</td>
<td>family member, friend</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4f</td>
<td>Single inservice</td>
<td>negative</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>family member</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4e</td>
<td>Single inservice</td>
<td>positive</td>
<td>3-5yrs</td>
<td>family member, friend</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4h</td>
<td>Single inservice</td>
<td>ambivalent</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>family member, friend</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4b</td>
<td>No training</td>
<td>negative</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>family member</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4c</td>
<td>No training</td>
<td>negative</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>family member</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15c</td>
<td>Certificate in gifted ed</td>
<td>ambivalent</td>
<td>3-5yrs</td>
<td>Little or none</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15e</td>
<td>Mini-cert in gifted ed</td>
<td>ambivalent</td>
<td>3-5yrs</td>
<td>family member</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15h</td>
<td>Program of in-school PL</td>
<td>positive</td>
<td>3-5yrs</td>
<td>family member, friend</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15a</td>
<td>Program of in-school PL</td>
<td>positive</td>
<td>11+</td>
<td>Little or none</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15d</td>
<td>Program of in-school PL</td>
<td>negative</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Little or none</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15f</td>
<td>Program of in-school PL</td>
<td>negative</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Little or none</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15g</td>
<td>Program of in-school PL</td>
<td>positive</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>friend</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15b</td>
<td>Program of in-school PL</td>
<td>positive</td>
<td>6-10yrs</td>
<td>family member, friend, recognize self as gifted</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26b</td>
<td>Mini-cert in gifted ed</td>
<td>ambivalent</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>family member</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26l</td>
<td>Program of in-school PL</td>
<td>ambivalent</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>family member, friend</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26f</td>
<td>Single inservice</td>
<td>positive</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>family member</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26d</td>
<td>Single inservice</td>
<td>ambivalent</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>family member</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Schools least successful in identification

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School Code</th>
<th>Formal qualifications and/or training in gifted education</th>
<th>Attitude Description - Gagné &amp; Nadeau Scale</th>
<th>Years directly involved in identification</th>
<th>Personal experiences with identifying giftedness</th>
<th>% of identified gifted in school</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>26a</td>
<td>Single inservice</td>
<td>positive</td>
<td>3-5yrs</td>
<td>Little or none</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26c</td>
<td>Single inservice</td>
<td>positive</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Little or none</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26g</td>
<td>Single inservice</td>
<td>negative</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Little or none</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26i</td>
<td>Single inservice</td>
<td>negative</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Little or none</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26j</td>
<td>No training</td>
<td>ambivalent</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>family member</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26m</td>
<td>No training</td>
<td>ambivalent</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>family member</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26e</td>
<td>No training</td>
<td>ambivalent</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Little or none</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26h</td>
<td>No training</td>
<td>ambivalent</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Little or none</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26k</td>
<td>No training</td>
<td>ambivalent</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Little or none</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26n</td>
<td>No training</td>
<td>ambivalent</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Little or none</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix OO. Sample of Data Coded for Defining Giftedness (using Nvivo) – Schools Least Successful in Identification

Name: Defining Giftedness
Coding Description: Potential, Ability
Interviewees: Non-successful Schools: 30
Frequency: Potential 36
Ability 42
Average use of terms potential/ability by interviewee: 2.6 times

Non-successful Schools

<Internals\Attitudes\Attitudes – Commitment and responsibility - LOW> - § 6 references coded [0.14% Coverage]

Reference 1 - 0.02% Coverage
think there’s a lot of potential that we’re actually wasting out

Reference 2 - 0.02% Coverage
helping that child meet their potential. I think there is a

Reference 3 - 0.02% Coverage
to see how far their potential can go. (026c, p.16

Reference 4 - 0.02% Coverage
helping them to achieve their potential. (026k, p.4)

Reference 5 - 0.02% Coverage
you are reaching their full potential they should be able to

Reference 6 - 0.02% Coverage
can help them reach their potential. I think that's the part

<Internals\Attitudes\Attitudes – Need for Identification - LOW> - § 9 references coded [0.60% Coverage]

Reference 1 - 0.07% Coverage
child is not reaching their potential, then we're doing them a
disservice. It's about reaching potential. (026b, p.4)
not going to reach their potential, ... so unless we provide them
with ways of reaching their potential, then it's either sink or
goes back to the educational potential of students, and us - our
but he won't reach the potential that he's able to reach
who go undiagnosed have the potential to not achieve their potential
potential to not achieve their potential which is the whole point
help each child reach their potential. So we owe that to
them to achieve their fullest potential. They need as much respect
them to reach their fullest potential. So we have to identify
I could see would have potential. If we had the process
when the teacher sees the potential, and then - so they might
Reference 1 - 0.01% Coverage
us that these children are potential G&T, ones that aren't

Reference 2 - 0.01% Coverage
he was going and his potential and what have you. I

Reference 3 - 0.01% Coverage
unclear] identification, is there educational potential that we're not seeing? (015P

Reference 4 - 0.01% Coverage
can see a bit more potential there, then from that point

Reference 1 - 0.03% Coverage
that, and they have the potential to do other things. You

Reference 2 - 0.03% Coverage
or they're not reaching their potential, they get lost, and I

Reference 3 - 0.03% Coverage
help them to reach their potential, because if they don't then

Reference 1 - 0.04% Coverage
can see that they have potential to do a lot better

Reference 1 - 0.06% Coverage
would be someone who has potential in an area or more
Reference 2 - 0.06% Coverage
generate in a potential. I guess they just stand

Reference 3 - 0.06% Coverage
ea particular area or shows potential to excel in a particular

Reference 4 - 0.06% Coverage
ea student who has the potential to excel in a particular

Reference 5 - 0.06% Coverage	hey're not reaching their full potential in class unless the teacher

Reference 6 - 0.06% Coverage
is someone who shows greater potential than what you expect at

*Non-successful Schools – ability*

Reference 1 - 0.30% Coverage
sometimes they don't show that potential because maybe they're not challenged

Reference 1 - 0.02% Coverage
to the best of their ability, their knowledge, to cater for

Reference 2 - 0.02% Coverage
rise up to that same ability so I think most teachers

Reference 3 - 0.02% Coverage
at this stage but their ability to do so is nowhere

Reference 4 - 0.02% Coverage
near as good as their ability to identify students with learning

Reference 5 - 0.02% Coverage
are a bit lower in ability levels and of course we

Reference 1 - 0.03% Coverage
other children perhaps sometimes. An ability to think laterally. (015a, p
Reference 2 - 0.03% Coverage
The ability to find key points. (015a
Reference 3 - 0.03% Coverage
Their understanding of concepts, the ability to complete work at a
Reference 4 - 0.03% Coverage
a lot greater and their ability is a lot greater than
Reference 5 - 0.03% Coverage
a hunch, as would their ability to comprehend any reading level
Reference 6 - 0.03% Coverage
knowing whether or not their ability is just good, just a

Reference 1 - 0.05% Coverage
as developed as their cognitive ability might suggest. So they might
Reference 2 - 0.05% Coverage
a strength or a high ability in a specific area, I'd
Reference 3 - 0.05% Coverage
One obviously their ability in academic in certain areas
Reference 4 - 0.05% Coverage
to show extension in their ability beyond their year level.
Reference 1 - 0.03% Coverage
in a student before. His ability to hold conversations with adults

Reference 2 - 0.03% Coverage
whether they have a special ability in leadership or sport or

Reference 1 - 0.02% Coverage
got some sort of innate ability that's outside the normal range

Reference 2 - 0.02% Coverage
or E in their general ability. I'm like, well that kid

Reference 3 - 0.02% Coverage
just got a good general ability. But this student is actually

Reference 1 - 0.04% Coverage
in their behaviour or their ability to get along with the

Reference 1 - 0.03% Coverage
Their understanding of concepts, they ability to complete work at a

Reference 2 - 0.03% Coverage
tasks to, obviously, suit his ability specifically mathematics. That was his

Reference 3 - 0.03% Coverage
is gifted - so achiever versus ability. I think, for me that

Reference 4 - 0.03% Coverage
they don't have that gifted ability. I've seen it within my

Reference 5 - 0.03% Coverage
just doesn't have that gifted ability so to speak. For me
Reference 1 - 0.03% Coverage

a strength or a high ability in a specific area, I'd

Reference 2 - 0.03% Coverage

Different things. One obviously their ability in academic in certain areas

Reference 3 - 0.03% Coverage

to show extension in their ability beyond their year level. Yeah

Reference 1 - 0.03% Coverage

are a bit lower in ability levels and of course we

Reference 2 - 0.03% Coverage

testing done because of her ability in reading and ability in

Reference 3 - 0.03% Coverage

her ability in reading and ability in writing.

Reference 4 - 0.03% Coverage

her reading, this is her ability to write,

Reference 1 - 0.04% Coverage

a hunch, as would their ability to comprehend any reading level

Reference 2 - 0.04% Coverage

with other children of similar ability. If she's not - obviously they

Reference 3 - 0.04% Coverage

her in terms of her ability to problem solve, or her

Reference 4 - 0.04% Coverage

to problem solve, or her ability in her giftedness. It's more
Reference 1 - 0.05% Coverage
rise up to that same ability so I think most teachers

Reference 2 - 0.05% Coverage
a 12 months' difference between ability honestly. The students, you could

Reference 3 - 0.05% Coverage
knowing whether or not their ability is just good,
Appendix PP. Sample of Data Coded for Defining Giftedness (using NVivo) – Schools Successful in Identification

Name: Defining Giftedness
Coding Description: Potential, Ability
Interviewees: Successful Schools: 18
Frequency: Potential 59
Ability 44
Average use of terms potential/ability by interviewee: 5.7 times

Successful Schools - potential

<Internals\Attitudes\Attitude - Need for identification- HIGH> - § 8 references coded [0.79% Coverage]

Reference 1 - 0.10% Coverage
that child to realise their potential. So, that would be really

Reference 2 - 0.10% Coverage
for them to reach their potential, to strive towards excellence, to

Reference 3 - 0.10% Coverage
challenged and working to their potential. So you can't have a

Reference 4 - 0.10% Coverage
they're not working to their potential. (012b, p.3)

Reference 5 - 0.10% Coverage
not working to their full potential.

Reference 6 - 0.10% Coverage
There's so much potential for them and so many

Reference 7 - 0.10% Coverage
learn what they - to their potential. (012c, p.4)

Reference 8 - 0.10% Coverage
showing their full capabilities and potential, (021b, p.3)
Reference 1 - 0.25% Coverage
not working to their full potential. It's an important part of

Reference 2 - 0.25% Coverage
haven't got anywhere near their potential. A lot of those kids

Reference 3 - 0.25% Coverage
are they reaching their full potential and it's differentiating the curriculum

Reference 4 - 0.25% Coverage
every child reaches their full potential, whether they're a student with

Reference 5 - 0.25% Coverage
working at their God-given potential. I think that it’s a

Reference 1 - 0.12% Coverage
the children can meet their potential. ... So it was a priority

Reference 2 - 0.12% Coverage
and you now, reach their potential. (021d, p.10)

Reference 1 - 0.02% Coverage
is a child with a potential to achieve above the ordinary

Reference 2 - 0.02% Coverage
per cent in terms of potential. The problem with those kids

Reference 3 - 0.02% Coverage
that they don’t achieve their potential. I mean you wouldn't need

Reference 4 - 0.02% Coverage
identifying those kids with that potential and then trying to do

Reference 5 - 0.02% Coverage
top 10 per cent with potential and the; you know the

Reference 6 - 0.02% Coverage
the talent is when that potential is achieved; but it's those
Reference 7 - 0.02% Coverage
but it's those kids with potential.
Reference 8 - 0.02% Coverage
know the biggest gap between potential and achievement is for the
Reference 9 - 0.02% Coverage
haven't got anywhere near their potential. A lot of those kids

Reference 1 - 0.04% Coverage
and not tapped into their potential at all. So a gifted
Reference 2 - 0.04% Coverage
the children can meet their potential. Does that answer the question
Reference 3 - 0.04% Coverage
I'm not saying capabilities - but potential.

Reference 1 - 0.07% Coverage
are they reaching their full potential and it's differentiating the curriculum
Reference 2 - 0.07% Coverage
that the student reaches their potential.
Reference 3 - 0.07% Coverage
every child reaches their full potential, whether they're a student with
the child to reach their potential. If you don't know that
that child to realise their potential. So, that would be really
for them to reach their potential, to strive towards excellence, to
can and to reach their potential.

grow and reach their full potential. I think that they do
performing at their level of potential. So yeah they're a really
think is their level of potential then what's the need to
challenged and working to their potential. So you can't have a
they're not working to their potential.
that aren't working towards their potential.
not working to their full potential. It's an important part of
Reference 1 - 0.05% Coverage
not going to reach the potential that they could reach in
Reference 2 - 0.05% Coverage
learn what they - to their potential.

Reference 1 - 0.05% Coverage
a student that has particular potential in a particular - one of
Reference 2 - 0.05% Coverage
that, although they have the potential in a particular area obviously
Reference 3 - 0.05% Coverage
or unable to meet that potential. We've had a few children
Reference 4 - 0.05% Coverage
working at their God-given potential. I think that it's a

Reference 1 - 0.07% Coverage
and not reaching their true potential. A gifted student could be
Reference 2 - 0.07% Coverage
that's not reaching their true potential, could be a gifted and

Reference 1 - 0.06% Coverage
showing their full capabilities and potential, possibly because they're bored or
Reference 2 - 0.06% Coverage
because that will show their potential without having the language barrier
I said. There's so much potential for them and so many

<Internal\Teachers\Copy of 021d CY> - $1 reference coded [0.04% Coverage]

and you now, reach their potential.

<Internal\Knowledge\Knowledge - defining giftedness> - $3 references coded [0.49% Coverage]

not going to reach the potential that they could reach in

a student that has particular potential in a particular - one of

and not reaching their true potential. A gifted student could be

<Internal\Knowledge\Knowledge Manifestations of giftedness - HIGH> - $2 references coded [0.11% Coverage]

that, although they have the potential in a particular area obviously

or unable to meet that potential. (012d, p.1)
Successful Schools - ability

Reference 1 - 0.19% Coverage

their thinking process and their ability process. (021a, p.8)

Reference 1 - 0.02% Coverage

a good test of general ability.

Reference 1 - 0.04% Coverage

more areas has above average ability. The ability may not - it

Reference 2 - 0.04% Coverage

has above average ability. The ability may not - it could be

Reference 3 - 0.04% Coverage

It could be a creative ability. It could be an intellectual

Reference 4 - 0.04% Coverage

It could be an intellectual ability in many different fields. They

Reference 5 - 0.04% Coverage

They don't necessarily display the ability as in they may not

Reference 6 - 0.04% Coverage

is I would say the ability above the average in one

Reference 7 - 0.04% Coverage

It's their attentiveness and an ability to adapt. It is also

Reference 8 - 0.04% Coverage

English, but straight away her ability to actually navigate this whole
Reference 1 - 0.03% Coverage
perform at their level of ability. But there are quite a

Reference 2 - 0.03% Coverage
showing work at above average ability. Often they do say those

Reference 1 - 0.04% Coverage
kinaesthetic. Yeah, just showing their ability in a different sort of

Reference 2 - 0.04% Coverage
the child was showing this ability in, to try and differentiate

Reference 3 - 0.04% Coverage
work on more at her ability.

Reference 1 - 0.04% Coverage
a significantly higher level of ability in a particular area, like

Reference 2 - 0.04% Coverage
working at their level of ability has lots and lots of

Reference 1 - 0.03% Coverage
the enrichment group or high ability, to me I don't worry
children who've got that mathematical ability, but also with the off

Reference 1 - 0.03% Coverage

Reference 1 - 0.13% Coverage

kinaesthetic. Yeah, just showing their ability in a different sort of

Reference 2 - 0.13% Coverage

more areas has above average ability. The ability may not - it

Reference 3 - 0.13% Coverage

has above average ability. The ability may not - it could be

Reference 4 - 0.13% Coverage

It could be a creative ability. It could be an intellectual

Reference 5 - 0.13% Coverage

It could be an intellectual ability in many different fields.

Reference 6 - 0.13% Coverage

a significantly higher level of ability in a particular area, like

Reference 1 - 0.04% Coverage

their work, the context, their ability to, once again, show me

Reference 2 - 0.04% Coverage

It's their attentiveness and an ability to adapt.

Reference 3 - 0.04% Coverage

showing work at above average ability. Often they do say those

Reference 4 - 0.04% Coverage

showing work at above average ability. Often they do say those

Reference 5 - 0.04% Coverage

They don't necessarily display the ability as in they may not
Reference 1 - 0.04% Coverage
more areas has above average ability. The ability may not it
Reference 2 - 0.04% Coverage
has above average ability. The ability may not it could be
Reference 3 - 0.04% Coverage
It could be a creative ability. It could be an intellectual
Reference 4 - 0.04% Coverage
It could be an intellectual ability in many different fields. They
Reference 5 - 0.04% Coverage
display the ability as
Reference 6 - 0.04% Coverage
is I would say the ability above the average in one
Reference 7 - 0.04% Coverage
It’s their attentiveness and an ability to adapt. It is also
Reference 8 - 0.04% Coverage
English, but straight away her ability to actually navigate this whole