Gifted and talented education in Aotearoa New Zealand: A primary school perspective

a thesis presented in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of

Master of Education

at Massey University, Manawatū, New Zealand

Jami Kimbrough Wallace

2016

Abstract

This research explores the state of gifted and talented education in New Zealand following the 2008 change in government and consequent shift in educational priorities. This case study examines the provision of gifted and talented education in a full, co-educational primary school in a provincial area. Data gathered from a variety of stakeholders indicate that, in its recent history, the school's provision varied considerably – from applying a structured, whole-school approach to lacking official policies and practices, to re-establishing school-wide provision. Provision was dependent on management priorities that often echoed national priorities that took the focus off of gifted and talented learners. These findings suggest that if national priorities do not explicitly include gifted and talented learners along with learners with special educational needs, then these students may be left vulnerable as schools shift their focus elsewhere. Recommendations for further research and effective provision of gifted and talented education are included.

Acknowledgements

I wish to acknowledge and thank all those who have contributed to the completion of this thesis.

Firstly, I want to thank my supervisors, Dr. Tracy Riley and Dr. Judith Donaldson. Their expertise, guidance and encouragement have been invaluable to me over the last three years. I also benefited greatly from the administrative assistance and kind support of postgraduate administrator Roseanne MacGillivray.

I further want to express my gratitude to the teachers, students and parents who participated in the study. I appreciate their time and candid reflections on gifted and talented education in their school.

I am also fortunate to be surrounded by a faith community that has supported my family and me during the inevitable triumphs and trials of life that occurred during this project. Special thanks go to my husband, Neil, who has believed in me and encouraged me throughout the process.

Lastly, I dedicate this work to my sons, Gus and Jesse, whose gifts have inspired this endeavour.

Contents

List of Tables

Glossary and List of Abbreviations

Domain Areas	The full range of ability areas whether natural abilities or developed talents
ECT	Enrichment Class Teacher
EOTC	Education Outside of the Classroom typically involving learning opportunities away from the school grounds
Individual Education Plan	A plan detailing adaptations to a school's programme for a student identified as requiring differentiated instruction and expectations
Kotahitanga	Unity, togetherness
LitQuiz	A competition based on children's literature for students 10-13 years of age
Mathex	A mathematics competition available to Year 7 – 10 students
NAGs	National Administration Guidelines detail the Ministry's administrative requirements for school leaders and boards of trustees in such areas as student achievement and employment and personnel matters.
NAG 1	NAG 1 (c) iii states that schools, through appropriate assessment data, must identify students and groups of students who have special education needs, including gifted and talented learners.
National Standards	A set of standards detailing the Ministry's expectations of achievement in reading, writing and mathematics for students in Years 1 to 8
NCEA	National Certificates of Educational Achievement are national qualifications for senior students offering internal and external standards across the learning areas in the New Zealand Curriculum.

PAT	Progressive Achievement Tests are standardised tests for literacy and numeracy.
PLD	Professional Learning and Development which is a requirement for teachers to maintain their certificate to practice
SENCO	Special Educational Needs Coordinator which is a leadership position in schools with overall responsibility for the organisation of adaptations to the teaching and learning for students with special needs
Te Toi Tupu	A Ministry PLD provider in a range of areas in education
Whakahihi	Arrogant, boastful
Whakama	Embarrassing, shameful

Chapter 1: Introduction

In its recent history, gifted and talented education has seen tremendous gains as well as significant setbacks. This can be largely attributed to shifting political agendas that have helped or hindered its advancement. Beginning in the late 1990s, a flurry of activity occurred nationally and gifted and talented education grew steadily for a decade. The 2008 change in government, with its shift in priorities, quickly halted progress.

Thus is the on-going wax and wane of governmental engagement in gifted and talented education. The Ministry of Education's (the Ministry) support and funding for gifted and talented education has certainly waned in the last eight years. However, research indicates that, despite declining governmental backing, gifted and talented education in New Zealand refuses to become outmoded.

This chapter details the recent history of gifted and talented education in New Zealand. In particular, it examines the impact of government priorities on the growth of gifted and talented education and the students for whom it caters. This chapter further provides a rationale for gifted and talented education in New Zealand. The chapter introduces me as the researcher and concludes with the aim of the research, the research questions and the structure of thesis.

1.1 Background

The following is a brief outline of the recent history of gifted and talented education in New Zealand. The history is well-documented in the literature (see, for instance, Bevan-Brown, 2012; Moltzen, 2004, 2011c; Riley & Bicknell, 2013). Therefore, this section is intended to provide a backdrop to the case study rather than a comprehensive historical review.

From the late 1990s, a range of advancements were made in New Zealand's gifted and talented education. The government of the time began to review and support gifted and talented education in a variety of ways such as increased resourcing and access to in-service training as detailed in Table 1. Professor Roger Moltzen, a

prominent New Zealand voice in the field of gifted and talented education (see, for example, Garrett & Moltzen, 2011; Moltzen, 2004, 2011a, 2011b; Riley & Moltzen, 2010), attributed the increased governmental interest in gifted and talented education to the Minister of Education (the Minister) of the time who linked the knowledge-based economy that developed around the turn of the century to gifted and talented learners (Moltzen, 2011c). Momentum for the advancement of gifted and talented education continued into the late 2000s.

The change of government in 2008 from a Labour-led to a National-led government saw changes to the support the Ministry would provide gifted and talented learners and educators as further detailed in Table 1. Bourne (2009) warned against the potential harm that the new government's shifting priorities would have for gifted and talented students. In particular, she believed that the 2010 implementation of National Standards, which prioritises under-achieving students, would negatively affect gifted and talented education. Her warning was based on effects that the No Child Left Behind (NCLB) legislature in the United States, which similarly prioritised low-achieving learners, had on its gifted and talented learners. The lack of funding and negative effect on learner outcomes is well documented (see, for instance, Bourne, 2009; Jolly & Makel, 2010; Loertscher, 2010; Robinson, 2009; Ward, 2005). Indeed, only very recently has gifted and talented education been added back into the United States' national legislature with new provisions in effect for the 2016-2017 school year ("Gifted and talented provisions in the Every Student Succeeds Act", 2016).

The repercussions from the current government's change in priorities and initiatives on gifted and talented education in New Zealand seems to have followed a similar path to that of the United States. New Zealand had a good reputation for providing for gifted learners in the early 2000s (Bourne, 2009; Fraser, 2011), though PISA (Programme for International Student Assessment for OECD countries) reports that the performance of New Zealand's gifted and talented students has been decreasing since that time. Readers have dropped from 19% to 14% in 2000-2012; science dropped from18%-13% in 2006-2012; and mathematics has dropped from 21%-15% in 2003-2012 ('Developing the next generation of innovators', 2014). Additionally, Riley (2012) recently reported that "the Ministry of Education does not include gifted and talented students in special education provisions, resources, funding and policies" (p. 195). Moltzen (2011c) similarly stated that "the momentum has slowed and some

Year	Initiative
1998	Advisory Group on Gifted Education established (Riley, 2002)
2000	*Gifted and Talented students: Meeting their needs in NZ schools*, based on the Advisory Group's recommendations, is published (Riley, 2002)
	Gifted and talented online: Realising potential, the gifted and talented site on Te Kete Ipurangi, established (Te Kete Ipurangi, 2016)
2001	National Working Party on Gifted Education, including more practitioners, replaces the advisory group
	The Working Party's report to the Minister, that informed much of the initiatives to 2008, includes "a vision statement for New Zealand's gifted and talented children, a concept statement of giftedness and talent, a set of core principles for gifted education in New Zealand and 11 specific recommendations" (Moltzen, 2011b, p. 19).
2002	Six full-time advisory positions begin with five subsequently added (Moltzen, 2011b)
2003-2008	38 Talent Development Initiatives (TDI) formed (Bevan-Brown, 2012)
2004	Comprehensive national research undertaken (Riley, Bevan-Brown, Bicknell, Carroll-Lind, & Kearney, 2004)
2005	A change to the National Administration Guidelines to include gifted and talented learners [NAG 1(c)iii] is implemented (Ministry of Education, 2012)
2006	New Zealand's largest gifted and talented conference with more than 700 participants, *Rising Tides: Nurturing our Gifted Culture*, occurred (Moltzen, 2011b)
2008	The Education Review Office (ERO) publishes their evaluation of gifted and talented education in 315 schools (Education Review Office, 2008a) as well as a report into good practice (Education Review Office, 2008b).
	The Ministry publishes parents' handbook *Nurturing Gifted and Talented Children: A Parent-Teacher Partnership* (Ministry of Education, 2008)
2009	The new Minister cuts funding to TDIs and disestablishes advisory positions (Moltzen, 2011b)
2010	A review of TDIs, instigated by the previous government, indicates that this approach to developing gifts and talents is promising (Riley & Moltzen, 2010).
	National Standards, prioritising low-achieving learners, in effect (Ministry of Education, 2010a)
	Success for All – Every School, Every Child, an initiative designed to support schools to cater for students with special educational needs through inclusive practices, includes gifted and talented students as a part of NAG 1 (Ministry of Education, 2010b)
2012	*Gifted and Talented Students: Meeting Their Needs in New Zealand Schools* is revised (Ministry of Education, 2012)
2014	The report to the incoming Minister regarding Success for All – Every School, Every Child fails to include gifted and talented learners (Ministry of Education, 2014)

TABLE 1: TIMELINE OF MINISTRY-LED OR -SUPPORTED INITIATIVES IMPACTING GIFTED AND TALENTED EDUCATION

significant gains made have since been lost" (p. 26). Riley and Bicknell (2013) additionally signal that gifted and talented education is in danger of stagnating.

Whilst this may be the case, all of these authors have found reason to hope that gifted and talented education in New Zealand will not disappear completely from the educational agenda. This hope is found at the "coal-face" of education. Educators and others involved in gifted and talented education are showing a growing awareness of the needs of gifted and talented students and a commitment to cater for them, despite declining governmental support (Moltzen, 2011c; Riley & Bicknell, 2013).

1.2 A Rationale for Gifted and Talented Education

This section will briefly articulate a rational for keeping gifted and talented education on the educational agenda.

Firstly, according to Professor Joseph Renzulli, a scholar who has shaped international gifted and talented understandings and practices for decades (Ministry of Education, 2012), up to 20% of learners may exhibit gifted behaviours (Renzulli, 2002). That is a significant number of children who may not be receiving an appropriate education in New Zealand. Yet, the current Ministry does not acknowledge or include the gifted and talented as a part of its inclusive education initiative for schools – Success for All (Ministry of Education, 2014; Tapper & Riley, 2015). This situation seems to directly contradict what the Ministry states is education's role – "to nurture, grow and realise every child's potential" (Ministry of Education, 2010b, para. 1).

Secondly, research shows a raft of negative outcomes that can occur for gifted and talented students if their abilities are left undeveloped and their needs are not supported properly. The negative outcomes will be expanded upon below.

Gifted and talented learners need to feel accepted for who they are and a part of a school that values their contributions (Moltzen, 2004). Schools need to ensure that gifted and talented learners can find acceptance in their learning environment. Kirby and Townsend (2005) found that while gifted and talented students mentioned a variety of stress points, the most dominant theme was social acceptance from teachers and peers. Peer acceptance can be a considerable issue for gifted and talented learners (Keen, 2005). These learners, particularly female gifted and talented learners, may try to

"dumb down" their true ability if they perceive that it will not be socially accepted (Keen, 2005; Luscombe & Riley, 2001). Socio-emotional stress, such as dealing with jealousy or friendship concerns, is a serious issue for students and can hinder them reaching their true potential (Townsend & Kuttner, 2005).

Boredom is another significant concern for gifted and talented learners. In Keen's (2005) study, two-thirds of the gifted learners who did not like school reported boredom – the work was just too easy. Students are often frustrated by a lack of challenge especially when they have to back track through material they have already mastered (Kirby & Townsend, 2005). Students have very little control over this situation and they are not simply deciding to be bored. Cathcart (2005) argues that boredom is not a choice but rather a situation hefted onto gifted and talented students with often negative emotions attached. Sheely and Silverman (2007) similarly assert that some students cannot find meaning or relevance in overwhelmingly boring and unchallenging educational environments. This can lead to disruptive behaviour, complete disengagement with material and psychosomatic illnesses.

Boredom and stressful learning environments can also lead to underachievement (Riley, 2012). Gifted learners who are not challenged appropriately in their learning may underachieve due to frustration and lack of motivation. Similarly, they may underachieve if they cannot work in groups with like-minded peers or are expected to work at the same pace as the others in the class (Margrain, Lee, & Farquhar, 2013).

There is potential for considerable negative outcomes to occur if schools allow gifted and talented learners to underachieve. Gifted and talented students who underachieve may suffer from affective issues and are considered at-risk (Joy, 2006). Furthermore, underachievement "may result in serious personal issues, extending beyond school failure to lack of contribution to, or sadly, failure in, society" (Riley, 2012, p. 193).

Some would also argue that providing effective gifted and talented education is a requirement for the advancement of society. Parkyn in 1975 indicated that the outcome for gifted and talented education is in not just mastery of knowledge but increasing knowledge by delving into the unknown and extending what we know, believe and understand (Cathcart, 2005). Needham (2012) argues that underachievement and loss potential amongst gifted and talented learners negatively

impacts not only the children, but also society. Bevan-Brown (2012) similarly asserts the vital importance of effective gifted and talented education for society:

> …in gifted education we have a great burden of responsibility. The challenge is not only to develop our gifted children's intellectual and creative abilities but also their sense of responsibility, their tolerance and caring for each other and the environment so that their inventions, policies and practices lead us away from the brink of earth's destruction rather than hastening our journey towards it (Section 4, para. 8).

Underpinning any rationale for gifted and talented education must be meeting the needs of children. Some New Zealand educators do not see the need for special support for gifted learners. They believe that gifted and talented students will naturally be able to succeed or view gifted and talented education as elitist (Anthony, Rawlins, Riley, & Winsley, 2002; Cathcart, 2005; Rawlins, 2004). Cathcart (2005) refutes these views and argues that not all gifted and talented learners will "rise to the top". Indeed, many will sink. Riley (2012) additionally asserts that gifted and talented students' learning and socio-emotional needs must be met and she posits that these learners require special educational support because they are entitled, like any other group of students, to effective and appropriate education. Furthermore, "…research indicates that many of the emotional or social difficulties gifted students experience disappear when their educational climates are adapted to their level and pace of learning" (Neihart, Reis, Robinson and Moon, cited in Riley, 2012, p. 197). Thus, the importance of providing effective and appropriate gifted and talented education to students who require it cannot be minimised.

1.3 Myself as Researcher

This study was inspired by my passion for discovering more about what happens in New Zealand schools in regards to gifted and talented education. As a mother of two gifted children, school board member and fully-registered teacher, I have experience in this area of inquiry. Moreover, I have a desire to advance the knowledge in this area in order to assist in efforts to see gifted and talented education in New Zealand further develop.

1.4 Research Aim

In this time of ebb at a national level, this case study aims to examine one school's gifted and talented journey in the decade after the inclusion of gifted and talented learners into the National Administrative Guidelines (NAGs). The research will include perspectives from the educators, the students and their parents. The aim is to discover what enables the provision of gifted and talented education as well as what barriers exist which hamper its efforts. A further goal of this case study is to add to the current knowledge of how schools are implementing the NAG 1 (c) iii requirements despite the absence of meaningful governmental support. (Please see the glossary for further details regarding the NAGs).

1.5 Research Questions

1. What is the school's policy for providing for the needs of gifted and talented learners?
2. How does the school identify gifted and talented learners?
3. What methods are used to implement the school's policy?
4. How does the school evaluate the effectiveness of the policy and its implementation?

1.6 Structure of the Thesis

The thesis includes the following chapters:

- Literature Review
- Methodology in Theory
- Methodology in Practice
- Case Description
- Discussion
- Conclusion

Chapter 2: Literature Review

2.1 Introduction

The purpose of this case study is to delve deeply into the gifted and talented education provided in one primary school in New Zealand in order to provide a snapshot of current practice, understandings and barriers to effective provision. With this in the mind, the literature review aims to provide a national perspective of gifted and talented education. The review examines what New Zealand researchers and experts consider to be good practice. Because New Zealand gifted and talented education has been influenced by international theory (Riley, Bevan-Brown, Bicknell, Carroll-Lind, & Kearney, 2004; Tapper, 2012), a limited number of pertinent international authors have been included.

2.2 Policy

The Ministry does not prescribe a national definition or set of procedures regarding gifted and talented students (Moltzen, 2011a; Riley, 2002; Tapper, 2012). This can be attributed to the diversity found in New Zealand and a lack of an internationally-accepted definition of giftedness and talent (Riley, 2002). The lack of prescription is consistent with the Ministry's general ideal of not taking a prescriptive approach with schools (Moltzen, 2011a). Regardless, the Ministry has required that schools identify and provide for the needs of gifted and talented learners as per NAG 1 (Education Review Office, 2008a). This leaves the onus on schools to develop their own policies and procedures.

Written policies are essential in effectively providing education for the gifted and talented (Education Review Office, 2008a). Programmes, plans and strategies are less likely to be "forgotten" if they are written into the policy (Bicknell, 2006). Additionally, in examining best practice in New Zealand schools, the Education Review Office (ERO) (2008b) concluded that one of the factors in effective gifted and talented education, was "high quality policies and procedures for teachers to implement…" (p. 39).

Policies should include the rationale of the school's gifted and talented programme (Ministry of Education, 2012). A rationale should express the school's reasoning for providing gifted and talented education. It should take into consideration the negative outcomes that can occur if the school neglects gifted and talented students' needs, such as students working under stressful conditions, maladjustive behaviour, and underachievement.

School policies should also include the school's definition of giftedness and talent (Education Review Office, 2008a; Ministry of Education, 2012). The lack of a national definition allows schools opportunities to define giftedness and talent and then provide for the needs of their gifted and talented students in ways that are appropriate and effective in their school and its culture (Moltzen, 2011a). Definitions should be multi-categorical, multicultural and recognise performance or potential in a range of domain areas (Education Review Office, 2008a).

Additionally, school policies should have clearly defined goals (Anthony et al., 2002). The Ministry (2012) recommends that schools use a needs analysis to get an indication of the current status of the gifted and talented education they provide including the strengths, weaknesses and interests of their staff and the wider community. This assists schools to develop goals that are realistic and suitable to their school and its stakeholders. An annual plan is also recommended by the Ministry which details how schools intend to implement policy and reach their goals.

Policies further need to be grounded in research and sound theory (Ministry of Education, 2012; Page, 2006; Riley, 2012) and take into account varying cultural understandings of giftedness and talent, which is discussed below (Bevan-Brown, 2011; Ministry of Education, 2012; Riley, 2012; Scobie-Jennings, 2013). Moreover, procedures are needed to inform the identification methods, differentiation approaches and evaluation of the gifted and talented plans and programmes (Ministry of Education, 2012). These areas are also discussed below.

2.3 Community Involvement

Input from a school's stakeholders is needed at every level of gifted and talented education from policy development through to evaluating the policy and

implementation (Anthony et al., 2002; Apted, Macnee, Court, & Riley, 2007; Bevan-Brown, 2012; Education Review Office, 2008b; Keen, 2005; Ministry of Education, 2012; Riley, 2012; Scobie-Jennings, 2013). In Keen's (2005) study, schools with effective gifted and talented programmes involved the whole school as well as the wider community.

Connecting with the parents and whanau of gifted and talented students is vital for providing effective gifted and talented education. Bevan-Brown (2012) urges a "strong, positive parent-teacher partnership" (Section 3, para. 3). Parents are an essential resource because they know their children's strengths, weaknesses, interests and habits in a different way than teachers (Joy, 2006). Moreover, parents can generally be trusted to reliably assist a school in identifying gifted and talented learners (Bicknell, 2006; Joy, 2006; Russell & Riley, 2011). Additionally, Bourne and Sturgess (2006) assert that strong relationships between home and school are required to create culturally safe environments for Māori learners.

Research also shows that parents can also positively influence student achievement (Bicknell, 2006; Macfarlane, 2010). Joy (2006) argues the importance of the sense of team between a school and the parents and whanau. Parents can support the classroom programme and assist in their child's learning. However, Bicknell (2006) found that parents in her study did not tend to make the first move. They took time to see how the school responded to the needs of their child. The involvement came only once advocacy was needed. It is vital that schools connect with parents and whanau and build a sense of team at the beginning of a gifted child's education at the school rather than wait until problems arise.

To make appropriate decisions for ethnic minority groups, these groups also need to be consulted regarding their conception of giftedness and talent and appropriate ways to develop it (Bevan-Brown, 2011; Cathcart, 2011; Frengley-Vaipuna, Kupu-MacIntyre, & Riley, 2011; Macfarlane, 2010; Ministry of Education, 2012; Riley, 2012). Bevan-Brown (2011) and Scobie-Jennings (2013) assert the importance of consulting with the local Māori community to better understand their conception of giftedness. Frengley-Vaipuna et al. (2011) likewise stress the importance of developing relationships with the local Tongan community and seeking their guidance regarding Tongan understandings of giftedness and talent. Additionally, due to the paucity of research undertaken regarding other Pasifika cultures and their understandings of giftedness (Frengley-Vaipuna et al., 2011; Ministry of Education, 2012), it is especially

important for schools to make meaningful connections with Pasifika students, families and communities to develop an understanding of the range of Pasifika conceptions of giftedness and talent.

Finally, because gifted and talented learners often need to create real-world products as a part of their education, connections with the broader community is needed as well (Ministry of Education, 2012; Riley et al., 2004). For instance, a gifted writer may be able to be published in the local newspaper or a gifted computer expert may be able to visit a local IT business.

2.4 Bi-cultural and Multicultural Considerations

Though bi-cultural and multicultural perspectives are evident throughout this literature review, these considerations are weighty enough to merit a section specifically devoted to them. Indeed, the importance of culture in education cannot be overlooked. Culture shapes individuals' worldviews which in turn influences how people interpret and respond to other people, issues, events and life itself (Cathcart, 2011). Culture's influence extends to all aspects of a school including its management, behaviour and academic expectations, discipline and teaching strategies (Cathcart & Pou, 2010). Furthermore, culture determines a school's definition of, provision for and attitudes toward gifted and talented learners (Bevan-Brown, 2010b).

The dominant culture in a society will set the way giftedness and talent is defined, which areas are valued and how to address the needs of the gifted and talented (Jenkins, Moltzen, & Macfarlane, 2010; Rymarczyk Hyde, 2010). Gifted and talented education in New Zealand classrooms tends to be based on the dominant Eurocentric understandings (Cathcart, 2011; Fraser, 2011; Frengley-Vaipuna et al., 2011; Jenkins et al., 2010). Thus, national policy and New Zealand authors consistently call for more culturally-appropriate and relevant understandings and practices to be in place at the coal-face (Bevan-Brown, 2012; see, for instance, Frengley-Vaipuna et al., 2011; Ministry of Education, 2012; Riley et al., 2004; Riley & Bicknell, 2013). Moltzen sums up the situation: "We really have to value giftedness from a broad cultural perspective rather than a Eurocentric perspective" (Fraser, 2011, para. 14).

The dominance of western culture is a negative influence on children from minority groups (Bevan-Brown, 2010b). The underrepresentation of Māori and Pasifika

students in gifted and talented education is an indication of this negative influence (Cathcart & Pou, 2010; Jenkins et al., 2010; Ministry of Education, 2012; Riley & Bicknell, 2013; Webber, 2011). Gifted and talented students from minority cultures are likely to be overlooked in New Zealand schools (Niwa, 2010; Scobie-Jennings, 2013; Webber, 2011).

The dominance of western culture in schools may be due to societal macro-level issues. Bevan-Brown (2010a) asserts that society assails Māori with negative feedback and that Pakeha pick up on these negative cues. Teachers can be swayed by society's negative feedback toward Māori and can have deficit thinking and "blame the victim" mentality (Bevan-Brown, 2010b). This can lead to low expectations and stereotyping which negatively impacts Māori learning and achievement because teachers with low expectations of Māori students do not spend as much time with them or challenge their work (Bevan-Brown, 2010a). Thus, teachers must move past negative societal influences, challenge their own conceptions of giftedness and talent and develop a working knowledge of and sense of celebration for all of the cultures in their classrooms (Bevan-Brown, 2010b). This can lead teachers to high expectations of all learners and a realisation that gifted and talented students exist in all cultures and ethnicities (Bevan-Brown, 2010a, 2012; Rymarczyk Hyde, 2010).

2.5 Professional Learning and Development

Research strongly indicates professional learning and development is necessary to ensure appropriate and effective gifted and talented education in schools (Apted et al., 2007; Bevan-Brown, 2012; Margrain et al., 2013; Riley & Sturgess, 2005; Rymarczyk Hyde, 2010; Scobie-Jennings, 2013; Watters, 2013).

Because gifted and talented students spend most of their time being educated in mainstream classes, all teachers should understand giftedness and talent, be able to identify gifted and talented learners and be able to cater to their needs (Apted et al., 2007; Bevan-Brown, 2012; Bourne & Sturgess, 2006; Cathcart, 2005; Moltzen, 2004; Riley & Sturgess, 2005). Gifted and talented learners have unique needs and may not always achieve well in a standard classroom environment (Bevan-Brown, 2012; Cathcart, 2005; Riley, 2012). Rowley (2003) asserts that teachers need to understand that “gifted education is a different educational culture to regular classroom teaching

and the identified competencies reflect clear differences between the instruction required for one group and the other" (cited in Riley & Sturgess, 2005, p. 39).

Most teachers want to meet the needs of gifted learners but lack experience and knowledge (Margrain, 2010; Riley & Sturgess, 2005). Therefore, ongoing education and sharing of information is necessary for teachers to have the skills and resources to adequately differentiate the curriculum and attend to their socio-emotional needs (Bourne & Sturgess, 2006; Cathcart, 2005; Margrain et al., 2013; Watters, 2013). Bevan-Brown (2012) further suggests that teacher training and in-service training should address attitudes that are detrimental to gifted and talented education such as the idea that "cream always rises to the top" (Cathcart, 2005) or the belief that all students are born with gifts (Needham, 2012).

Teachers also need training to identify gifted Māori learners and how to differentiate appropriately for them. Teachers may struggle to identify gifted Māori learners due to insufficient training and may not understand the perspectives of other cultures due to their own mono-cultural and "ethnocentric views and attitudes" (Rymarczyk Hyde, 2010, p. 97). Bevan-Brown (2010b) explains that teachers inexperienced with culturally-responsive teaching and learning rarely know how other cultures may respond to the content and process of teaching and learning. Teachers may not understand how their cultural connections actually create a disconnect for those students not clued in. Teachers may punish or react negatively to behaviour that seems "wrong" (Bevan-Brown, 2010b). Not knowing the "hows" of varying cultures or about culturally inclusive pedagogy limits teacher choice on how to respond to situations (Macfarlane, 2010). Thus, Bevan-Brown (2005) urges teachers to review their knowledge of and attitude toward Māori students and how this affects their teaching of gifted Māori learners.

PLD should involve teachers in the whole school (Apted et al., 2007; Watters, 2013). Bevan-Brown (2012) suggests that teachers use individual professional development plans that assist them to reflect on and create personalised learning plans for themselves instead of using a "one-size-fits-all" model. Teachers should be able to co-construct their learning so that the training is based on the real needs of their classrooms, their personal passions and their weaknesses as teachers (Bevan-Brown, 2012; Riley & Sturgess, 2005; Russell & Riley, 2011). The learning must also be viewed as an on-going process as teachers' needs and the needs of their gifted and talented students change (Bevan-Brown, 2012).

2.6 Identification

Identification is a vital component in a school's gifted and talented education. It is the link between a school's policy, the students and the provisions required to meet their needs (Anthony et al., 2002; Ministry of Education, 2012). Formal identification procedures are needed to ensure that teaching and learning is effective (Ministry of Education, 2012). Identification is not about separation, elitism or labels. Rather, identification allows teachers to meet the needs of the gifted and talented (Cathcart, 2005).

Identification procedures should be school-wide and be based on multicultural and multi-categorical understandings of giftedness and talent (Gagne, 2007; Keen, 2006; Margrain, 2010; Ministry of Education, 2012; Moltzen, 2004). It should further employ methods that seek out students who may have hidden talents (Fraser, 2011; Ministry of Education, 2012; Renzulli, 2002). Identification should also be an on-going process (Ministry of Education, 2012).

Identification methods can be formal or informal. Formal identification includes cognitive tests, achievement data and checklists. Informal identification can include conversations with parents and use of portfolios (Ministry of Education, 2012).

Data can be gathered from achievement testing already in use in New Zealand schools such as the Progressive Achievement Test (PAT) and NCEA exams (Ministry of Education, 2008). Teachers can also use observation scales such as the New Zealand-developed Teacher Observation Scales for Identifying Children with Special Abilities or the Purdue General Characteristics Checklist (Joy, 2006; Russell & Riley, 2011). Additionally, parents have a wealth of information about their children and are an invaluable and reliable source of information regarding giftedness and talent (Bicknell, 2006; Joy, 2006; Russell & Riley, 2011). Peer- and self-identification is also a method schools can utilise to identify gifted and talented learners (Joy, 2006; Te Kete Ipurangi, 2016).

It is necessary to use a variety of identification approaches to adequately identify gifted and talented learners (Joy, 2006; Ministry of Education, 2012; Moltzen, 2004; Russell & Riley, 2011). Relying on a single method leaves some gifted and talented learners at risk of being overlooked (Renzulli, 2002). For instance, intelligence tests such as "the Wechsler Intelligence Scale for Children-III (WISC III), WISC-IV and the

Standford Binet 5 are commonly used in New Zealand" (Joy, 2006, p. 51). These are reliable sources, however, many types of giftedness cannot be measured in such a quantifiable way (Cathcart, 2005; Gagne, 2007). Furthermore, these tests may not suit students with strong non-Western cultural links as they may not have had the educational and contextual opportunities necessary to do well on a particular test (Renzulli, 2002; Rymarczyk Hyde, 2010). Additionally, there is some concern regarding the use of PAT scores in isolation. Niederer et al. (2003) assert that the PAT is not intended to identify mathematically gifted learners. These learners think qualitatively differently to even those non-gifted learners who reach the highest band in the PAT.

Students may present with behaviours, attitudes or disabilities that can provide barriers to identification. Gifted learners who exhibit maladjustive behaviours may not be identified (Wellisch et al., 2011). Some gifted learners underachieve at school (Anthony et al., 2002; Ministry of Education, 2012; Moltzen, 2004). They may mask their ability to fit in socially (Keen, 2005; Luscombe & Riley, 2001). Scobie-Jennings (2013) found that Māori children did not want to take part in the gifted and talented programme and faced negative peer pressure regarding academic success. Some gifted learners have learning difficulties as well which can hinder their academic performance and mask their true potential (Anthony et al., 2002; Ministry of Education, 2012).

Teachers' values, assumptions and attitudes can also create barriers to identification. Students from economically disadvantaged backgrounds are not as likely to be identified as gifted and talented as students from more advantaged backgrounds (Ballam, 2016; Ministry of Education, 2012). In Keen's (2005) study, a third of the identified gifted learners came from professional homes. Of those, 50% were from homes with some type of educational connection which indicates this group of students is overrepresented. Conversely, gifted and talented students from semi-skilled or unskilled labouring families were identified at approximately half the rate of New Zealand European and Asian students (Keen, 2005).

Additional authors conclude that Māori gifted learners are at risk of being overlooked (Niwa, 2010; Scobie-Jennings, 2013; Webber, 2011). The underrepresentation of Māori learners in gifted programmes is highly linked to classroom teachers, who tend to have little or no experience working with diverse gifted and talented learners and who may be basing identification on narrow understandings of giftedness and talent (Scobie-Jennings, 2013; Webber, 2011).

To help alleviate these issues, schools need to offer rich, challenging learning, and culturally responsive environments where those with potential can have an opportunity to show their giftedness (Renzulli, 2002). Teachers need to constantly look for giftedness in their students. Moltzen urges teachers to see every child as potentially gifted. "If you use that lens, [the students] may not be exhibiting it today but they might in a particular activity you create tomorrow, or you may find out something from their whanau that will give you an insight…" (Fraser, 2013, para. 14).

2.7 Provisions

To appropriately meet their needs, learners identified as gifted and talented require qualitatively differentiated programmes across a continuum of approaches (Joy, 2006; Margrain et al., 2013; Ministry of Education, 2012; Riley et al., 2004). At its core, differentiation aims to match individuals with appropriate instruction (Riley, 2012). However, it must be more than additional, "busy" work or projects that utilise the same types of methods and create the same type of products (Ministry of Education, 2012). This means that a differentiated curriculum needs to be "organized to include more elaborate, complex, and in-depth study of major ideas, problems, and themes that integrate knowledge within and across systems of thought" (Cooper, 2009, cited in Margrain et al., 2013, para 4).

The literature regarding provisions for gifted and talented students is abundant and covers a range of topics from the types of programmes to inclusive practices and use of curriculum models to acceleration (see, for instance, Bate, Clark, & Riley, 2012; Maker & Shiever, 2005; Ministry of Education, 2012; Moltzen, 2006; Russell & Riley, 2011; Townsend, 2011). The following section is a brief overview of provisions that the literature recommends for effective provision as well as areas of debate amongst educators.

Appropriate planning and preparation underpin all of the provision information detailed below. Exceptionality should not emerge by happenstance (Grant, 2013). Rather, thorough planning, based on theory and research, is needed so that gifted learners do not receive an ad hoc or fragmented education with no clear structure for progress (Bate et al., 2012; Robinson, 2009).

2.7.1 Differentiated Teaching and Learning

Provisions should incorporate conceptual learning because it is well-suited to the way gifted and talented students think. These learners tend to thrive when the learning centres on the abstract, broad-based thinking and big picture concepts that can be seen in a variety of settings (Bate et al., 2012; Cathcart & Pou, 2010). Furthermore, curriculum integration is further recommended as it lends itself to conceptual learning; concepts are rarely confined to one curriculum area (Moltzen, 2006). Additionally, curriculum integration can also help to create a culturally-inclusive and responsive environment. Curriculum integration centred on personal or social issues and including whakapapa may help children to feel valued and heard as well as helping Māori gifted and talented learners to better achieve (Brough, 2007; Jenkins et al., 2010; Webber, 2011).

Gifted and talented programmes should also aim to develop a range of thinking skills. Bate et al. (2012) have identified a range of thinking skills including "creative thinking, critical thinking, caring thinking, metacognition and questioning" (p.25). Allowing students to work with multiple ways of thinking can help students feel valued because their "out-of-the-box" thinking is valued.

Furthermore, learning should be challenging and complex (Brough, 2007; Renzulli, 2002). Gifted learners "…can thrive on complex material even if they do not appear to have mastered 'the basics'…. Teachers [must] not take a mastery approach by holding back complex material while waiting for basic skills to develop" (Joy, 2006, p. 54).

Activities and educational products should also be authentic and be applicable in the "real" world (Bourne & Sturgess, 2006; Jenkins et al., 2010; Joy, 2006; Webber, 2011). The Ministry (2012) and Riley et al.(2004) recommend that the processes of learning should be based on the real processes of practitioners. Likewise, products should be "'real' solutions to 'real' problems" (Ministry of Education, 2012, p. 55).

Lastly, the gifted and talented provisions should also be co-constructed with students. Bate et al. (2012) assert that students should be able to make choices about how and what they will learn. Bourne and Sturgess (2006) found that co-construction can help gifted learners feel more committed to learning and to stay engaged.

2.7.2 Differentiated Environment

The environment is a crucial ingredient in successful education of all children. Gifted learners are not gifted in a vacuum; experiences, personality, and social milieu all effect how they will personally respond and progress in their learning environment (Cathcart, 2005; Margrain et al., 2013). According to Renzulli's (2002) Three-Ring Conception of Giftedness, gifted behaviours are influenced by the environment and the context, thus educators need to consider what learning environments encourage gifted behaviours. Gifted and talented students develop "…task commitment and creativity as a result of being involved in challenging situations in which [they] have an existing or emerging interest" (Renzulli, 2002, p. 71). Ability, personality, interest, will power and self-determining behaviours are highly influential in developing talent. Students need to be interested in the work even in the best learning environments (Garrett & Moltzen, 2011). Likewise, Professor Françoys Gagné's model of talent development, The Differentiated Model of Giftedness and Talent, also considers the environment to be a critical factor in turning gifts into talents (Gagne, 2007). Personality traits and characteristics along with teachers, schools, parents, the community and a student's social milieu combine "to enhance, restrict, or even curb the talent development process" (Garrett & Moltzen, 2011, p. 167).

A learner-centred classroom environment is essential in gifted and talented education (Needham, 2012). Gifted learners are people first and their individuality needs to be celebrated and used to create effective learning environments (Cathcart, 2005). Thus, the pedagogy teachers employ must be flexible and respond to individual students' interests, strengths and learning needs (Bate et al., 2012; Joy, 2006; Moltzen, 2004; Riley, 2005; Riley & Sturgess, 2005). Indeed, "writers such as Smutny, Van-Tassel-Baska and Feldhusen view teachers' abilities to recognise and nurture young gifted and talented students' specific talents within quality differentiated programmes as vital to the development of individual potential" (Garrett & Moltzen, 2011, p. 166).

Culturally appropriate learning environments help Māori learners to value their own culture which in turn can help them achieve and improve their sense of academic self-worth. It also helps them understand how to be Māori and gifted (Webber, 2011). Many Māori gifted and talented learners have to make a choice between being Māori and being gifted. Māori need to be able to be Māori at school and not be expected to leave their cultural identity at home (Jenkins et al., 2010). Bevan-Brown (2012) argues

that developing gifted and talented Māori students' abilities cannot be at the expense of their culture.

Whilst schools often provide opportunities such as powhiri, kapa haka groups and Te Reo classes, these do not fully meet the needs of Māori learners (Bevan-Brown, 2010a; Cathcart & Pou, 2010). "For these needs to be met, Māori students should see their culture reflected and valued in all subjects and activities" (Bevan-Brown, 2010a, p. 68). Māori culture needs to be "normal" and embedded into the learning environment and curriculum (Cathcart & Pou, 2010). Bevan-Brown (2005) posits that to be culturally responsive, from a Māori perspective, the environment needs to a.) value and support diversity; b.) incorporate Māori content, skills, and customs; c.) value the cultural understandings and behaviours instead of trying to change them; and, d.) use culturally preferred methods to teach and assess.

In this type of environment, gifted and talented Māori learners may be more willing to display their abilities. "Standing out" from the group tends to go against Māori values of kotahitanga – a sense of unity (Macfarlane, 2010). Thus, if they do not feel culturally safe, Māori learners may feel whakahihi – arrogant and boastful – and will not make their abilities known; they may feel it is inappropriate as it goes against their upbringing. Likewise, if the learning environment is culturally appropriate, Māori parents may feel less whakahihi about disclosing their child's gifts and talents (Jenkins et al., 2010).

Culturally responsive learning environments recognise the value of each person's context instead of prizing one context over another (Brough, 2007). Access to the same lessons as Pakeha can be a problem if those lessons never, or very rarely, reflect the culture and values of Māori who identify strongly as Māori (Bevan-Brown, 2010a). Cathcart and Pou (2010) argue that

> Māori children should have equal opportunity and encouragement to continue to achieve in skills valued by Māori culture and that such achievement should be measured and rewarded by our education system in ways that acknowledge it as equivalent in status to achievement in skills valued by Pakeha culture (p. 16).

2.7.3 Acceleration versus Enrichment

Within the learning environment a variety of approaches are taken to differentiate education. Acceleration and enrichment are two options that underpin a school's programme.

Acceleration is a "vertical" rather than "horizontal" extension of the curriculum (Wardman, 2009). Acceleration can be a full year skip, curriculum compacting or telescoping, using tutors, mentors or special classes to increase the pace (Anthony et al., 2002).

Research indicates that acceleration can be academically beneficial for gifted and talented learners (Bevan-Brown, 2012; Kirby & Townsend, 2005; Rawlins, 2004; Wardman, 2009). New Zealand research indicates that acceleration is the highest factor for educational achievement with an effect size of .88 (Wardman & Hattie, 2012). Similarly, Roger's (1991) study reported an academic effect size of .78 (Wardman, 2009). Furthermore, accelerated high school mathematics students found that being a part of an accelerated programme was academically beneficial and many commented on how they would have been bored and unmotivated if they were not accelerated (Anthony et al., 2002; Rawlins, 2004).

Research further suggests that acceleration does not pose a risk to gifted learners' socio-emotional well-being (Ministry of Education, 2012; Rawlins, 2004; Wardman & Hattie, 2012). Wardman (2009) notes that the socialisation effect size of .46 for students who skipped a year furthers the idea that both academics and social well-being can be positively impacted through use of acceleration. Furthermore, the girls in Martin's (2006) study achieved at very high levels and did not report negative socio-emotional outcomes after six months of acceleration.

Despite what Townsend (2006) refers to as "overwhelming evidence of the positive effects of acceleration" (cited in Wardman, 2009, p. 25), acceleration is not widely used in New Zealand (Bevan-Brown, 2012; Rawlins, 2004; Wardman & Hattie, 2012). Parents and teachers overseas and in New Zealand are cautious of accelerating or year skipping (Gagne, 2007; Kirby & Townsend, 2005). One consideration regards the social and emotional impact of acceleration (Rawlins, 2004). Needham's (2012) study found that teachers thought that students would not be able to cope socially or emotionally with older students. Furthermore, some parents and educators do not agree with acceleration because it goes against conventional expectations whilst others

disagree on philosophical grounds about fairness (Wardman & Hattie, 2012). This suggests that decisions are being based on their perceptions, fears, and assumptions regarding acceleration instead of the research (Kirby & Townsend, 2005; Ministry of Education, 2012; Wardman & Hattie, 2012).

It is possible that parents and teachers holding students back could be causing more harm than good. Wardman and Hattie (2012) note that "there is substantial evidence of bored, lonely gifted students who have been retained with age-peers" (p. 32). Townsend (1996) further warns that "in our attempt to safeguard against the assumed harmful effects of burnout we have been incognisant of the malignant effects of rustout" (cited in Rawlins, 2004, p. 44).

Despite the generally positive benefits of acceleration, acceleration needs to occur on a case by case basis with a flexible approach to ensure that it is a fitting option for the students (Kirby & Townsend, 2005). There have been some instances of gifted learners not adapting in accelerated programmes (Rawlins, 2004; Wardman, 2009). Other students found that even within an accelerated programme, they were bored (Kirby & Townsend, 2005). In both Anthony et al.'s (2002) and Rawlins' (2004) studies, students mentioned the need for flexibility so that they could go in and out of accelerated programmes as they suited the students' needs. Wardman (2009) suggests the need for selection criteria to assist educators and parents in deciding if acceleration is a good option for individual children that includes motivation and emotional development.

Schools in New Zealand are more likely to use enrichment as a part of their differentiation practice. Enrichment refers to learning opportunities that provide depth and breadth to the curriculum in ways that offer more challenging activities (Ministry of Education, 2012). Enrichment opportunities should be relevant to students' areas of interest and ability and be co-constructed so that gifted and talented learners can make choices about their learning (Gagne, 2007).

Moltzen (2004) argues that the prevalence of enrichment approaches is due, in part, to widely-held egalitarian views in New Zealand which are discussed below. He also notes, however, that enrichment is perceived as an easier option for teachers. Wardman (2009) found that the majority of the teachers and student teachers in her study were more favourable to enrichment activities than to acceleration. This aligns with findings from Riley et al.'s (2004) study that indicate that schools were more likely to plan for enrichment than to plan for acceleration. Similarly, though two-thirds of the

respondent schools in Riley and Bicknell's (2013) study indicated they prefer to combine accelerative and enrichment approaches, when reporting actual learning opportunities, accelerative options were identified the least.

Moltzen (2011a) and Townsend (2011) argue that enrichment is not necessarily the best option. This is supported by Hattie's (2009) finding that enrichment's effect size of .39 was significantly less than the effect size of acceleration in regards to education achievement (Ministry of Education, 2012; Wardman & Hattie, 2012).

Acceleration and enrichment do not need to represent dichotomous options, however. These options can balance each other when used conjointly. Use of enrichment ensure that schools provide sufficient depth and breadth to topics and acceleration ensures that students are not subjected to "busy work" (Anthony et al., 2002, p. 13). Rawlins (2004) concludes that "the challenge is not to determine which of these two strategies to employ in schools but rather to provide an integrated program that gives flexibility in meeting the learning needs of a highly varied population" (pp. 49-50).

2.7.4 Inclusive versus Exclusive Classrooms

Schools must also decide whether to group gifted learners homogenously or heterogeneously. These are another set of underpinning options for schools and, like acceleration versus enrichment, are often debated and viewed as dichotomous.

Gifted and talented learners need to spend time with like-minded peers (Bate et al., 2012; Bourne & Sturgess, 2006; Erb, 2008; Margrain et al., 2013). Homogeneous grouping enhances gifted students' learning. Hornby, Witte and Mitchell (2011) and Hornby and Witte (2014) found that placing students in between-class ability groups, often referred to as streaming or tracking, benefits learners in the high ability class. Bate et al. (2012) assert that homogenous grouping "allows students to be appropriately challenged, encourages motivation and helps with a realistic understanding of their own abilities" (p. 24). Erb (2008), when describing a camp for gifted mathematics students from various schools, notes that the children worked well together despite many not knowing each other. "They thrived on the opportunity to work with like-minded children" (para. 9). Gifted and talented learners also enjoy socialising with each other

because they are more likely to have things in common, similar senses of humour and ways of thinking (Bate et al., 2012).

Homogenous grouping has been criticised, however, and it is not the preferred method of grouping in New Zealand schools. Research indicates that students in the lower-ability classes are disadvantaged because they tend to receive material that is below the curriculum level with less opportunities for enrichment and learning conversations with more advanced students (Bevan-Brown, 2010a; Hornby & Witte, 2014; Hornby et al., 2011). Of further concern is the over-representation of minority students and those from low socio-economic backgrounds in the bottom streams (Bevan-Brown, 2010a; Hornby & Witte, 2014; Hornby et al., 2011). Thus, retaining gifted and talented learners in the regular classroom with peers of a similar age is the preferred option particularly in primary education in New Zealand (Ministry of Education, 2012; Moltzen, 2006; Riley et al., 2004).

New Zealand primary classrooms have been moving toward providing inclusive learning environments. These environments cater for all children's needs by providing flexible learning opportunities in response to students' needs. Inclusive education has been criticised because problems can occur for the gifted and talented if it is not handled well (Kirby & Townsend, 2005). Moltzen (2006) notes that some educators do not think inclusive classrooms can be flexible enough to cope with the full spectrum of student need. Furthermore, Cathcart (2005) cautions that students may have to cope with boredom as they encounter the same content and/or the same pace day after day (Cathcart, 2005). Additionally, the results of learning can be disappointing. Students might be able to produce more advanced work if they could work alone or in homogenous groups (Kirby & Townsend, 2005).

As with acceleration and enrichment, some combination of heterogeneous and homogenous groupings is advantageous. The New Zealand curriculum is not "lockstep", thus teachers have flexibility in grouping students according to ability level which is common in subjects like English and mathematics (Bourne & Sturgess, 2006). Ideas and concepts can be accelerated within a regular classroom which may be able to raise standards for all students (Cathcart, 2005; 'Developing the next generation of innovators', 2014; Hornby et al., 2011). Bourne & Sturgess' (2006) study found that clustering groups of gifted learners in a regular classroom positively impacted all learners so they were more successful at performing at their true ability level.

2.8 Evaluation

Evaluation and self-review is the final critical component in providing effective gifted and talented education (Apted et al., 2007; Education Review Office, 2008a; Ministry of Education, 2012; Page, 2006; Riley, 2005; Riley et al., 2004; Riley & Moltzen, 2011; Russell & Riley, 2011). Schools need to ensure that their provision is positively benefiting individual student outcomes and is based on the principles of gifted and talented education and current best practice (Page, 2006; Riley & Moltzen, 2011).

Evaluation and self-review should be evident throughout schools' development of gifted and talented programmes. Schools should review their current provisions and complete a needs analysis as they begin to develop a gifted and talented programme (Apted et al., 2007; Ministry of Education, 2012). Likewise, evaluation should be planned as the programme is being further developed (Riley & Moltzen, 2011).

Evaluation should employ a team approach that consults with stakeholders and experts in gifted and talented education (Riley & Moltzen, 2011). This should include students, parents and teachers and can incorporate written reflections, discussions and interviews (Russell & Riley, 2011). Van Tassel-Baska (2004) posits that "involvement increases relevance, understanding, and ownership of the evaluation, all of which facilitate informed and appropriate use" (cited in Riley & Moltzen, 2011, p. 25).

Evaluation and self-review should be an on-going process and incorporate formative and summative elements. Teachers can assess what interventions are needed for a gifted learner, formatively gather evidence during the year, adjust provisions as necessary and summatively evaluate the effectiveness of the interventions. Moreover, educators can follow the same process to identify their own needs, evaluate themselves as they progress, critically review their progress at the end of a school year and make recommendations for the following year (Riley & Moltzen, 2011).

2.9 Chapter Summary

New Zealand understandings of gifted and talented education have been examined in this literature review. The review has revealed that good practice is multi-

faceted. Schools must examine a variety of considerations as they set out to appropriately cater for gifted and talented students. These considerations include the use of written policies that include a rationale and school-wide definition of giftedness and talent; consultation with schools' wider communities; on-going PLD for teachers; the application of a range of identification procedures; learner-centred and responsive provisions; and effective evaluation. All of these aspects should be underpinned by multi-categorical and multicultural understandings of giftedness and talent, as well as current research and theory.

Chapter 3: Methodology in Theory

3.1 Introduction

This chapter discusses the methodology used in this case study from a theoretical perspective. The purpose of educational research and the qualitative approach of this study will be explored. Case study research and its specific tools for gathering data will be detailed. The chapter will conclude with an examination of ethical considerations and data analysis.

3.2 Purpose of Educational Research

The purpose of research for many educators is improving the quality of practice (Bassey, 2003; Pratt & Swann, 2003). "We do research to understand…in order to make our schools better places for both the children and adults who share their lives there" (Tunmer, Prochnow, & Chapman, 2003, p. 84). But, curiosity and the desire to discover are also at the heart of much educational research (Auerbach & Silverstein, 2003; Swann & Pratt, 2003). Indeed, discovery is a necessity. Pratt and Swann (2003) "think that research should be undertaken as a matter of principle – the principle of care for others" (p. 188). Care, in this case, is the creation of new knowledge (whether it be, for example, discovering what works, what does not work or understanding people's world views) which underpins eventual improvements to educational practice via research.

Two broad approaches are taken to procure new knowledge - hypothesis-testing research and hypothesis-generating research. These can be referred to as positivist – quantitative research and interpretive – qualitative research (Ary, Cheser Jacobs, & Sorensen, 2010; Auerbach & Silverstein, 2003; Burton, Brundrett, & Jones, 2014; Scott & Usher, 1999; Yin, 2009). These approaches are defined by a researcher's philosophy regarding things such as ontology – how reality is defined; positionality – how does the researcher fit within the research setting; rationale – why is research to be undertaken; and, epistemology - how knowledge is created (Burton et al., 2014; Scott & Usher,

1999). Exploring these concepts in detail is outside of the scope of this discussion, however, it will pay to consider the two approaches a little further.

Quantitative research seeks to test and confirm theories and then explain phenomena based on the theory, whereas qualitative research strives to understand humans and their behaviour in a particular setting (Ary et al., 2010). Burton et al. (2014) use two analogies to help distinguish between the two. They compare the hypothesis-testing researcher to a miner who digs for new information; they compare the hypothesis-generating researcher as a traveller who gathers new information through the journey and encounters with situations and people.

Many authors (see, for instance, Bassey, 2003; Burton et al., 2014; Yin, 2009) acknowledge that the boundaries between the two types of research are not always clearly defined. Mixed methods can be used and often researchers with differing conceptions collaborate (Burton et al., 2014; Swann & Pratt, 2003; Yin, 2009). Swann and Pratt (2003) go so far as to argue that "...we do not think that there are quantitative or qualitative methodologies as such, only quantitative and qualitative techniques" (p. 4).

Although this case study will make use of questionnaires and a small amount of statistical data, the study ultimately seeks to generate hypotheses through the use of predominantly qualitative approaches. Accordingly, the remainder of the discussion will mainly revolve around qualitative research practice.

3.3 General Qualitative Research

As aforementioned, Ary et al. (2010) indicate that qualitative research aims to understand a phenomenon in a particular setting. Auerbach and Silverstein (2003) likewise note that the goal of qualitative research is to "discover meaningful patterns, descriptive of a particular phenomenon" (p. 3). Central to qualitative studies is the aim of understanding the way others live and view the world (Ary et al., 2010). Furthermore, qualitative approaches include placing studies within the natural context (Ary et al., 2010; Auerbach & Silverstein, 2003; Patton, 2015; Yin, 2009). In short, qualitative research examines the real-life circumstances of events and people (Ary et al., 2010).

Ary et al. (2010) note that qualitative methods include gathering descriptive data, utilising an emergent design and inductive analysis. Auerbach and Silverstein (2003) identify the following as qualitative methods: subjective experiences are examined, meaningful stories collected, rich descriptions gathered, participants may be used as expert informants, a reflexive research tool (the researcher), and researcher subjectivity. Scott and Usher (1999) also assert that coding and classifying, finding relationships between the classification, identifying patterns and themes are vital in qualitative research.

3.3.1 Issues for Qualitative Research

Patton (2015) explains the on-going issue of qualitative research being perceived as the weaker research approach. He notes that it can be referred to as "soft". However, he contends that qualitative research is essential to the advancement of knowledge. Qualitative research answers "how" and "why" questions (Yin, 2009). In doing so, qualitative research is a useful approach for educational research. Qualitative research can describe how and why educational interventions, strategies and practices are or are not effective (Patton, 2015).

3.3.2 Good Qualitative Research

The first step to good research is to select a problem (Ary et al., 2010; Pratt & Swann, 2003). Ary et al. (2010) suggest that beginning researchers should choose something from their experience about which they are passionate or strongly curious in order to enjoy the process of discovery. Pratt and Swann (2003) concur and add to the list a topic that angers the researcher and needs some type of action. They additionally stress that a good research problem needs to identify a "mismatch between expectation and experience" (Pratt & Swann, 2003, p. 179). A good research problem will seek to examine situations in which what is happening is not what is expected to happen.

Once the problem is selected, research questions must be developed. These guide what information you need and how you will gather it (Drever, 1995). As a parent dealing with gifted and talented education in schools and associated with gifted and talented community groups, I suspected that a mismatch existed between good

practice models and what schools could achieve in the current political environment. Because I wanted to discover the enablers and barriers to provision, from multiple perspectives and to some depth, the choice of case study research was apt.

3.4 Case Study Research

Case studies focus intensely on one contemporary context to produce rich descriptions of the situation. Cases should be chosen for their ability to highlight the phenomena being studied so they can be used to shed light on issues relating to the wider population of cases (Bassey, 2003; Gerring, 2006). Case studies can also be used to offer participants valuable insights into their circumstances (Bassey, 2003).

Though case study methodology has no codification (Yin, 2009), there are some general aspects of case study research that are often incorporated. The case must be a real-life context in which the researcher has spent time but has not manipulated. Multi-method approaches are often utilised and the factors that make up the current phenomenon are examined (Ary et al., 2010; Burton et al., 2014; Yin, 2009).

3.4.1 Issues with Case Study Research

Similar to Patton (2015), Yin (2009) is dissatisfied that the value of case studies has been minimised, by some researchers, along with other types of non-experimental research. This is generally due to the fact that case studies do not typically seek causal relationships directly as does much of experimental research. This can be overcome by using case studies in conjunction with scientific studies because, as mentioned above, case studies and other qualitative methods answer questions about the context in which certain effects occur (Patton, 2015; Yin, 2009).

A longstanding issue in case study research is the potential for bias (Ary et al., 2010; Gerring, 2006; Patton, 2015; Yin, 2009). Researcher subjectivity, preconceptions and assumptions can influence the gathering of evidence (e.g. what types of questions are asked and what is observed and documented) which can lead to bias in conclusions (Ary et al., 2010). While bias can be found in other types of research, Yin (2009) concludes that the reason bias keeps cropping up for case study research is because it is

more usual to encounter it and less likely to be dealt with appropriately. He believes this can be resolved through the use of rigorous procedures, but notes the paucity of texts that deal specifically with case study research methods and procedures.

The next issue for case study research is its lack of generalisation (Ary et al., 2010; Bassey, 2003; Gerring, 2006; Patton, 2015; Scott & Usher, 1999; Yin, 2009). However, findings from single scientific experiments are likewise rarely generalised. Only after they have been replicated in various contexts are findings generalised (Yin, 2009). The same approach can be applied to case study research (Gerring, 2006). Yin (2009) asserts that the goal a case study is to extend theories and make generalisations. Bassey (2003) concurs and has devised a way of making generalisations. He refers to them as "fuzzy" generalisations due to the large numbers of variables in social science research. Fuzzy generalisations "ask 'What *may* work, *and in what circumstances may this apply*'" (Bassey, 2003, p. 164, original emphasis). He then suggests that researchers make a "BET" (best estimate of trustworthiness) which may become more accurate with the addition of multiple case study findings. Thus, he also calls for replicating case studies in order to make generalisations to the wider population.

3.4.2 Good Practice in Conducting Case Studies

Good case study research includes trustworthy findings, ethical conduct and respect for others, and significant outcomes that are reported in a meaningful and audience-appropriate manner (Bassey, 2003). Good practice for case studies further requires flexibility. Yin (2009) explains that "...case studies require an inquiring mind *during* data collection, not just before or after the activity" (p. 69, original emphasis). Likewise, researchers need to be able to adapt their design as unanticipated information crops up. They also need a thorough understanding of the topic including theory, policies and politics in order to interpret the data and to quickly spot any contradictions in the data (Yin, 2009).

Because researchers need to be very familiar with the topic, they are susceptible to bias. To counter this, Yin (2009) advises researchers to be "...open to contrary findings" (p. 72) and to allow supportive, yet constructive, colleagues to review their findings. The following chapter will discuss bias and generalisation as they relate to this study.

3.5 Data Collection

The following section outlines the theory related to the data collection methods used in this study. The methods will be described in Chapter 4.

3.5.1 Interview

Interviewing is one of the most common data collection methods in qualitative research (Ary et al., 2010; Yin, 2009) and it is particularly common in qualitative educational research (Burton et al., 2014; Drever, 1995). Interview data make up much of the evidence in this study. Hence, interview methodology will be examined in detail.

Interviews can be unstructured, structured, or semi-structured (Ary et al., 2010; Burton et al., 2014; Drever, 1995). Unstructured interviews are like purposeful conversations that have a focal point and allow for an unfolding discussion about that focal point (Ary et al., 2010). The interviewee is allowed to direct the flow of the discussion more so than in semi-structured or structured interviews (Burton et al., 2014; Drever, 1995).

On the opposite end of the interview spectrum is the structured interview. The researcher directs the course of a structured interview and there is little flexibility to modify the questions (Ary et al., 2010; Drever, 1995). Structured interviews can allow the researcher to gather information more quickly than unstructured or semi-structured interviews, however, the answers are typically brief and lack depth (Burton et al., 2014).

Between these two interview types is the semi-structured interview which has been employed in this study. The researcher formulates questions but has the flexibility to modify questions as the research unfolds (Ary et al., 2010; Drever, 1995). Though the researcher directs the interview, the respondent is allowed to answer at length and in depth. Typically, researchers use prompts, probes and follow-up questions to allow for greater depth of responses (Burton et al., 2014; Drever, 1995; Scott & Usher, 1999). Prompts tend to be open questions designed to "jog" a participant's memory; probes tend to be closed questions designed to clarify a response. Follow-up questions can be asked to explore an answer that was unexpected yet pertinent to the study (Patton, 2015).

The unanticipated response is one of the many strengths of interviewing, particularly semi-structured interviewing, as a data collection method (Ary et al., 2010). Interviews allow the researcher to gather a great deal of detailed and in-depth data in one "go" (Ary et al., 2010; Burton et al., 2014). They also offer the interviewer a chance to explain any misunderstandings regarding the questions, to observe participants' mannerisms, gestures and body language which assists in the final analysis, and the data is assured - the researcher is not waiting on the return of questionnaires (Drever, 1995).

Furthermore, interviews allow participants to express opinions and perspectives about the phenomenon being studied (Ary et al., 2010). The conversation helps generate knowledge and insights can be gained through the interview process that may not be gained through the use of questionnaires or observations (Burton et al., 2014). Education is a social activity in which diverse perspectives and values play a major role in the context and the "how" of teaching and learning in a school. Thus, Scott and Usher (1999) argue that interviewing is a critical method in educational research "...because the preconceptions, perceptions and beliefs of social activities in educational settings form an inescapably important part of the backdrop of social interactions" (p. 108).

Issues with Conducting Interviews

Nevertheless, the researcher is presented with some challenges when using interviews as a data collection method. An issue for interviewing is bias. Bias can come from two perspectives – the researcher or the interviewees. The researcher's values, assumptions and perspectives can influence the conduct and analysis of interviews (Burton et al., 2014). "The researcher needs to understand that it is their sociality and the way that this is inscribed in social practices, language and discourses which constitute the research process" (Scott & Usher, 1999). The interviewer's body language, tone of voice and use of language sends messages to the participants. Interviewees may try to answer in a way that they think the researcher wants (Drever, 1995) or they may feel a disconnect between themselves and the researcher (Scott & Usher, 1999) which can skew the data that is collected. Moreover, participants may not

tell the (whole) truth (Ary et al., 2010). Researchers must also take care not to be swayed by a key informant (Yin, 2009).

Time is another issue when conducting interviews. It takes at least one hour per session to conduct an interview, not including other factors such as travel and setting up (Ary et al., 2010; Burton et al., 2014; Drever, 1995). The analysis of the interview data, including reviewing notes, coding and transcribing audiotape recordings, is also time consuming (Ary et al., 2010). Drever (1995) advises researchers to ensure they set realistic timeframes and goals for conducting interviews because the depth of data gathered is worth the time.

Focus groups can be used to ease the issue of time. A focus group is a group interview in which respondents with varying perspectives and values can provide rich data (Ary et al., 2010). The benefits of a focus group interview lie in the interactions that occur in the interview. Firstly, varying opinions can be gathered in one session. Secondly, the group dynamics can be monitored. Lastly, because "...individual attitudes, beliefs, and choices of action do not form in a vacuum[,]...listening to others helps people form their opinions" (Ary et al., 2010, p. 439).

Good Interview Technique

The issues mentioned above can be overcome by using good interview techniques. These include the use of a schedule that includes a preamble, consideration of the type and order of the questions and conducting the interview appropriately.

Semi-structured interviews need to be carefully planned and the schedule needs to be prepared in advance (Drever, 1995). Burton et al. (2014) suggest that the schedule should be given prior to the interview so the participants can consider their answers. An interview schedule is essential to effective interviewing because it guides the interview and reminds the participants that the conversation is formal (Drever, 1995).

The use of a preamble as a part of the schedule can help ensure the interview is effective. A preamble reminds participants about what they have agreed to do as a part of the interview (e.g. assurances regarding anonymity or data security) as well as provides information about the topic of the interview. It is a framework in which the

researcher can explain more fully about the interview structure and subject as well as clarify any jargon or terms being used (Burton et al., 2014; Drever, 1995).

Also within the schedule are the questions to be asked. The questions asked and how they are asked are essential in gathering valid data because, put simply, interview questions help people talk about what they know (Drever, 1995). It is important that the questions (as well as prompts, probes and follow-up questions) are asked in a way that allows participants to answer as honestly and fully as possible. Burton et al. (2014) encourage the use of open-ended questions to foster expansive responses.

Yin (2009) identifies two types of interview questions – Level 1 and Level 2. Level 1 questions are non-threatening, help to establish a rapport and create a friendly atmosphere. Establishing a good rapport with participants is important because the researcher is in control of the interview (Drever, 1995; Scott & Usher, 1999). Thus, respondents need to feel like they can respond honestly and fully to the researcher's questions. Level 2 questions answer the questions set forth in the research inquiry (Yin, 2009). Whilst it seems obvious that the questions should be formulated in a way that will provide evidence suitable for the aim(s) of the study (Burton et al., 2014), the language used can be problematic. To ensure the questions are unambiguous and can be understood by the interviewees, Drever (1995) suggests that the language choice be precise and appropriate to the participants.

The order of the questions is another important element of an effective interview. "The order of your questions affects what people have in mind when they answer each one, and this can influence what they say" (Drever, 1995, p. 22). Both Burton et al. (2014) and Drever (1995) suggest placing general questions (e.g. the description of the role) early in the interview to help establish the friendly atmosphere and assist interviewees to "settle in" to the conversation. Further questions can take respondents into the deeper, more thought-provoking territory.

Burton et al. (2014) assert that face-to-face interviewing is the best method because the participant's mannerisms, tone of voice, body language and facial expressions can be monitored. In the same way that an interviewee's "person" can be monitored, so too can the researcher's person be read by a respondent. Thus, the researcher needs to critically reflect on how his or her age, dress, tone of voice, and cultural affiliation can affect or be perceived by the participants (Scott & Usher, 1999).

Similarly, the way of conducting the interview can influence the way a participant responds, for example, seating arrangements can suggest power relationships

(Scott & Usher, 1999). Taking notes can be distracting (Ary et al., 2010) and may unintentionally highlight seemingly important parts of the response to the participant (Burton et al., 2014)). Using an audio recording device and limiting note taking is advised (Ary et al., 2010; Burton et al., 2014).

3.5.2 Questionnaire

A questionnaire is a data collection method similar to an interview (Burton et al., 2014). The similarity comes from the questioning that is in a written versus oral form and, like a structured interview, uses fixed questions (Scott & Usher, 1999).

Questionnaires tend to be used for larger samples or for cross-site or cross-level research (Burton et al., 2014). Advantages of using questionnaires include the economical use of time, the possibility for participant anonymity, a potentially high return rate and standardised questions that can aid analysis (Ary et al., 2010; Burton et al., 2014).

Issues with Questionnaires

Scott and Usher (1999) note the issue that questionnaires rely on participants to write their responses. This, as well as the need for participants to read the questions, may be problematic. The researcher is relying on the participants to understand what is being asked and be able to express themselves in a written format (Ary et al., 2010). Burton et al. (2014) further comment that the information gathered from questionnaires is more descriptive than explanatory and it can be superficial.

Additionally, educational research can be small in scale which means that the sample may be small. Open-ended questions can be used in questionnaires to gather the most details and in-depth data as possible in order to counter the lack of statistically significant findings (Ary et al., 2010; Burton et al., 2014).

Good Questionnaire Technique

Like conducting interviews, certain ways of executing questionnaires are particularly effective in gathering the right type of data and overcoming issues. These include using a cover letter, the type of questions used (or not used), and the order of the questions.

A cover letter is necessary when using a questionnaire. The researcher is not present to answer questions or place the questionnaire in the context of the study. A cover letter can do this job for the researcher (to some extent) and assists the participants to provide useful responses (Burton et al., 2014).

A response rate of at least 30% is necessary to provide enough data and offer validity. Burton et al. (2014) suggest that "...questionnaires need to be as accessible, not too long, not too onerous, well-presented and as interesting as possible to secure returns" (p.141). As a part of this assertion, they suggest that the order of the questions is as important as it is in interviewing. It is also similar. They suggest starting with questions about the participants and then delving into more complex issues, opinions and offering opportunities to expand on answers and provide further information (Burton et al., 2014).

With no ability to make clarifications, certain types of questions should not be asked in a questionnaire. Examples include leading questions, overly complicated questions and questions that try to ask two questions in one (Ary et al., 2010; Burton et al., 2014).

3.5.3 Document Analysis

Document analysis is a useful method for gathering data in qualitative educational research (Ary et al., 2010). Documents can be written or non-written, printed or electronic and include artefacts (Ary et al., 2010; Burton et al., 2014). Ary et al. (2010) further categorise documents into four types: "public records, personal documents, physical materials and researcher-generated documents" (p. 442). Public records include government documents such as curriculum statements, strategic national plans or organisation-based records such as websites and annual reports. Personal documents include personal communications such as letters and emails as well as

photographs or audio and/or video recordings (which can also be found in government and organisational contexts). Physical materials include historical artefacts or buildings. Researcher-generated documents are those the researcher has put in place such as participant journals kept at the request of the researcher (Ary et al., 2010; Burton et al., 2014; Yin, 2009).

Document analysis is an unobtrusive way to gather data that are permanent forms of evidence useful in triangulation (Ary et al., 2010; Burton et al., 2014). Burton et al. (2014) suggest that document analysis can create a "...baseline against which other sources can be compared and contrasted" (p. 103). In effect, documents can show what should be or is expected to be occurring versus what is occurring. Yin (2009) asserts that document analysis is essential to case study research. Document analysis can provide specific details such as titles or spelling and implies certain things about an organisation (e.g. what an organisation says it values; information provided unwittingly). As well, it can help to confirm and enhance other types of evidence, or potentially offer contradictory findings that provide the researcher a different perspective on the study (Burton et al., 2014; Yin, 2009).

Issues with Document Analysis

Like the other data collection methods mentioned above, researchers need to overcome some issues with document analysis.

Firstly, documents may not be authentic or representative of the people involved in the study (Burton et al., 2014). Moreover, they may not be accurate or "...the unmitigated truth" (Yin, 2009, p. 105). Researchers must remember that documents were written for some purpose and audience other than the study (Burton et al., 2014; Yin, 2009). Thus, researchers should verify the authenticity and genuineness of documents as well as seek to understand what the purpose and audience was to accurately interpret the content. Just as document analysis can be used to corroborate other data, additional evidence must be used to verify the documents (Ary et al., 2010).

Good practice in Document Analysis

The researcher must be critical when analysing documents due to the issues raised above. Burton et al. (2014) explain that researchers should employ external and internal criticism. External criticism provides for reliability because the research must ascertain the authenticity of the evidence. Internal criticism provides for credibility as the researcher verifies accuracy and pertinence of data. Evaluating the language and writing style can be helpful in this process (Burton et al., 2014).

3.6 Ethical Considerations

Ethical conduct is a cornerstone for research (Ary et al., 2010; Bassey, 2003; Pratt & Swann, 2003). Reviewing and using the university's ethics procedure is the first "move" for student researchers (Ary et al., 2010; Pratt & Swann, 2003). Accordingly, ethical requirements of Massey University have been applied to this study. These are detailed in Chapter 4.

Respect and care for others underpins ethical considerations (Ary et al., 2010; Bassey, 2003; Pratt & Swann, 2003). This includes the permissions that are sought in terms of conducting the research based on the focus of inquiry, the use of data, and how results are published. Preserving anonymity and/or confidentiality in research further shows care toward the participants (Bassey, 2003). Burton et al. (2014) also recommend advising participants about how the research will be conducted (e.g. use of audio recordings and document analysis) and of their rights.

Additionally, Pratt and Swann (2003) urge researchers to think about the possible ramifications of their presence, questions, actions and conclusions on the participants of the study. They further note concern over the protection of participants "from breaches of confidence, undue pressure, [and] stress..." (Pratt & Swann, 2003, p. 188).

Care and respect for persons extends to issues involving culture. Living in a bi-cultural nation necessitates culturally relevant ethical considerations. "For indigenous and other marginalized communities, research ethics [is]...about establishing, maintaining, and nurturing reciprocal and respectful relationships" (Smith, 2005, cited in Ary et al., 2010, p. 445). Ary et al. (2010) note that researchers are indebted to

participants and reciprocation is recommended. This may include sharing research results, providing advice or assistance, or other useful and wanted actions. Building respectful relationships includes awareness of underlying power relationships in the research. Questions need to be asked about why the research is taking place and for whose benefit. Examples are how will the research highlight the community and how, or will, control be shared (Ary et al., 2010; Johnston, 2003)?

Qualitative research has some particular ethical considerations. Ary et al. (2010) caution against allowing the relationships to stray too far from researcher/the researched into a "friends" relationship. They also comment that potential ethical dilemmas involving who owns the information must be considered.

3.7 Analysis

Qualitative analysis is the process of turning raw data into findings (Patton, 2015). Three main steps have been identified in analysing this qualitative data: "Making the text manageable[,] hearing what was said[, and] developing theory" (Auerbach & Silverstein, 2003, p. 42).

Qualitative methods generate a large amount of data that needs to be organised. The researcher needs to interpret the data and consider what stories are being told through the data (Patton, 2015). Researchers should spend time immersed in the data to find patterns and significant themes, and draw conclusions (Auerbach & Silverstein, 2003).

In a case study, data can be organised into a case record that has classified the raw data and edited it down to the most pertinent information. The case study itself, in this study referred to as the case description, tells the story of the case being investigated in a way that is appropriate for the audience (Yin, 2009). The story told indicates the researcher's interpretation of the data (Patton, 2015). The analysis approach taken in this study is detailed in the next chapter.

3.8 Chapter Summary

Educational research seeks to improve and support teaching and learning in schools. Qualitative research, which examines the context of teaching and learning, is a valuable way to do so. In particular, case study research has been chosen to delve deeply into one case that can be used to highlight issues in the larger population. Case study methodology specific to this study has been examined. The next chapter describes the methodology in action for this study.

Chapter 4: Methodology in Action

4.1 Introduction

This chapter details the methodology used to conduct the study. I will further explain why I chose to conduct a case study and why the school was chosen as a subject. This chapter will also include participant details, the approaches I took to collect data, the ethics process followed, and the analysis of data.

4.2 Case Study as Research Framework

I chose to use case study as a research framework so I could gain in-depth knowledge and understanding of one school's gifted and talented education. The timing was pertinent as data were gathered 10 years after the inclusion of gifted and talented learners in NAG 1 and five years post the implementation of National Standards. (Specifically, data were gathered at the end of the school year in late November and early December.) Further, the study was designed to shed more light on what is happening at the coalface of gifted and talented education in New Zealand.

4.3 Researcher Bias

My experience in the New Zealand education system gave me some insights which lead to a "hunch" about what may be or may not be happening in New Zealand schools. The initial supposition was that New Zealand schools were struggling to provide appropriate gifted and talented provision without adequate governmental support. However, as a case study researcher, it was important that this initial hunch remained just that – a guess or a question, instead of a hard-wired assumption (Yin, 2009).

I was very aware that my supposition and varying roles meant that I might have taken my assumptions, values and understandings about gifted and talented education into the research setting. However, being aware of my preconceptions helped me to ease the potential for bias because I was able to watch out for these in my thinking. As

described in this chapter, I have followed, as closely as possible, the good practice recommendations detailed above to minimise bias and increase reliability and validity of the study. Furthermore, being supervised, my findings and analysis were reviewed by objective and more-experienced researchers.

4.4 The Case

The school was chosen because it was a primary school that offered formal gifted and talented provisions. Upon initial conversations with the key informant, it became evident that the school's recent gifted and talented education history echoed that of national recent history. Thus, it showed potential to be a case that would help illuminate the larger population.

4.5 Participant Details

This section provides information about the school and the participants. As well, the recruitment method is described.

4.5.1 School Demographic Information

The case study was conducted in a decile 3, co-educational, full primary school in a provincial area in the North Island of New Zealand. The school had a roll of approximately 380 students of which 52% were male and 48% were female. Fifty-nine percent of students identified as NZ European/Pakeha, 36% identified as Māori, 2% as Pacific and 3% as another ethnicity (Education Review Office, 2014). Before commencing with the study, a letter was sent to the Principal to gain permission to undertake the research (see Appendix A).

4.5.2 Enrichment Class Teacher

I made contact with the teacher of the gifted and talented class at the school, the Enrichment Class Teacher (ECT). She was keen to participate in the study and, once permission was granted by the Principal, became the key informant in this case study. As key informant at the school, the ECT helped to facilitate interviews as described below. She also participated in an in-depth interview.

She had taught the Year 7 and 8 Enrichment Class since its creation three years previous. She had formerly taught a year 7 and 8 mainstream class for four years and, before that, was the school's gifted and special needs coordinator.

4.5.3 Special Education Needs Coordinator

The ETC invited the special education needs coordinator (SENCO) to participate in the study. Upon agreement, I requested that she take part in an in-depth interview. She had taught in the school for ten years and was the deputy principal and SENCO for the last three years.

4.5.4 Classroom Teachers

Six classroom teachers were similarly asked to participate in the study by the ECT and agreed to participate in a focus group interview. These teachers represented a cross-section of the teachers at the school. They varied in years of teaching experience and taught across a range of age levels and teaching teams. They also displayed a variety of areas of expertise (e.g. one teacher taught in the bilingual unit, one was heavily involved in sports and another was a musician).

4.5.5 Students

The ECT allowed me to explain the research to the students in the Enrichment Class (n=24) and invite them to complete a questionnaire. Seven female students from

the class returned permission forms from their parents to take part. This was a 29% response rate.

All of the students identified as NZ European/Pakeha. Four also identified as another ethnicity – Australian, English, French and Māori. The students were completing either Year 8 (n=5) or Year 7 (n=2).

4.5.6 Parents/Whanau

I asked all of the students in the Enrichment Class to take home the parent/whanau questionnaire for a parent and/or caregiver to complete. Six completed surveys were returned in sealed envelopes to the survey drop box set up in the classroom. This was a response rate of 25%.

4.6 Interviews

Once the interviewees agreed to take part in the study, I gave them an information sheet and a copy of the interview schedule. These were made available to all participants at least one week in advance. The information sheet contained an introduction to me and the research, the purpose of their interview for the research and specifics of the location and timeframe for the interview. It concluded by detailing their rights as participants, the consent process and contact details. (The interview cover sheets are presented in Appendices B-D.)

The interview schedule began with a preamble that was read to participants at the beginning of the interviews. The interview questions began with Level 1 questions that aimed to gain a rapport and progressed to more complex, and potentially contentious, Level 2 questions. Questions were written in a way that encouraged in-depth responses in a manner as non-threatening as possible (see Appendices E-G).

All interviews were conducted face-to-face at the school. Agreeable times were organised and the indicated timeframes of the interviews were adhered to. All interviews were audio-recorded and I transcribed them. No notes were taken during the in-depth interviews. I took notes during the focus group to identify the teachers when transcribing. Each teacher was allocated an initial, TA to TF, and I wrote their initial on

their consent form. This allowed me the ability to remove participants from the study if necessary.

4.7 Questionnaires

An information sheet and questionnaire were distributed to the participating students and parents. The information in the cover letter is as per the interview cover letter except for the details regarding location and timeframe. (The information sheets are presented in Appendices H and I.)

Similar to the order of interview questions, the student questionnaire (see Appendix J) began with questions about them and progressed to questions regarding the teaching and learning in the classroom. Likewise, the parent questionnaire (see Appendix K) began with gathering information about their child and moved onto questions regarding themselves and the learning environment. Questions in the questionnaires were designed to be easily understood by participants. Furthermore, the number of questions was kept brief to assist in the response rate.

Parent questionnaires were completed away from school and returned to the classroom as mentioned above. After parental consent was obtained (see Appendix L), I conducted the student questionnaire in a classroom adjacent to the students' classroom. The students were given a questionnaire and I outlined the information in the cover sheet and read through each question. Time was given for students to ask questions regarding the survey.

4.8 Document Analysis

The documents I analysed were the school's website, official policies and procedures for gifted and talented education and special education needs, information regarding the recent whole-school PLD programme in gifted and talented education, the identification form, artefacts in the enrichment classroom including wall displays, and classroom planning documents.

I applied external criticism of the documents by checking for authenticity. The school's website was maintained by staff at the school and the policies were available

on the website. Information regarding the PLD and the identification form aligned with other data sources. The artefacts in the classroom were taken as genuine as it was highly unlikely that the Enrichment Class's home classroom would be filled with displays that were not their own. Lastly, the planning book was in the ECT's handwriting which matched writing on the whiteboards in the classroom.

Internal criticism, involving triangulation, is discussed below.

4.9 Ethical Considerations

My supervisors and I undertook an ethical review of the study. After I completed a screening questionnaire (see Appendix M), it was decided that the project was low-risk. Thus, a low-risk notification was submitted to Massey University and ethics approval was granted. (The notification and approval are presented in Appendices N and O).

Participants were made aware of their rights in both the information sheets and verbally before commencing with the interviews or questionnaires. The exception was the parents who only received an information sheet as they did not participate face-to-face. The staff, students and parents were under no obligation to participate in this research. At all times, participants were able to decline to answer questions, withdraw from the study, ask questions about the study and ask for the audio recording to be turned off as applicable.

Informed Consent was gained from all participants as well as parental permission for those under the age of sixteen. The consent forms for the interviewees were signed at the beginning of the interviews (see Appendices P and Q). Completion and return of the surveys provided informed consent for the parents and students. The parents also returned a parental consent form for a child under the age of sixteen, as mentioned above.

Participants were assured of confidentiality, anonymity and the secure storage of data. A confidentiality form (see Appendix R) was signed by those involved in the focus group and I have kept all information confidential. The final thesis has been written in a way that ensures that the people involved in the study, as well as the location and name of the school, are anonymous. The data will be securely stored at Massey University upon the completion of the project.

4.10 Data Analysis

I managed the data by creating a case report. Raw data were reviewed and patterns were identified. After selecting relevant responses, the data were organised into categories based on repeated ideas.

I triangulated the data to enhance the credibility of the study (Ary et al., 2010). The data from the interviews, questionnaires and document analysis were used to corroborate (and/or contradict) each other. This helped to strengthen the categories and confirm the key themes.

Theory was developed by organising the categories into more general theoretical constructs that could be transferred to other case studies. Chapter 5 describes the context of the school's gifted and talented education. Chapter 6 – the discussion – retells the school's story in relation to the theoretical constructs and the literature.

4.11 Generalisation

This case study can be read along with Riley and Bicknell's (2013) national research as well as recent, more-localised studies (see, for instance, Scobie-Jennings, 2013; Warmke, 2015) to begin to make generalisations about the current state of New Zealand's gifted and talented education.

4.12 Chapter Summary

This chapter has examined the research methodology employed in this study. This included information about the school and the participants, the method of data collection, ethical considerations and data analysis. The chapter has furthermore discussed how I dealt with researcher bias and how this study can be used to make generalisations.

Chapter 5: Case Description

5.1 Introduction

The purpose of this chapter is to portray a "snapshot" of the overall provision of gifted and talented education in the school. To contextualise the snapshot, the description details the school's recent history in regards to gifted and talented education. The schools' guidelines and rationale for gifted and talented education are also set out. The school's definition of giftedness and talent, its identification procedures, provisions and self-review process are further outlined. The description incorporates the perspectives of students, parents/whanau, teachers, the ECT and the SENCO.

5.2 The School's Recent Gifted and Talented History

Post the inclusion of gifted and talented learners in Nag 1 and its 2005 implementation in schools, the school had developed a school-wide gifted and talented programme, Looking Beyond, which showed evidence of good practice. It included a register of gifted and talented learners based on identification forms that teachers regularly updated. The identification form included areas of giftedness and talent from a wide range of domains. The learners' needs were catered for using a continuum of approaches in a responsive environment. Provisions included flexible ability groupings in classrooms, competitions, and withdrawal programmes. The programme was coordinated by the ECT and supported by senior management.

In 2009, a new principal was appointed and this coincided with the ECT taking on a new role as a mainstream classroom teacher. School priorities shifted after this change in leadership and the gifted and talented programme declined significantly. The SENCO indicated that Looking Beyond "faded away and then we had nothing". For some time, the school had no official policies, identification procedures or provisions in place for gifted and talented learners. The ECT recounted, "I could see a few things changing with the new principal – focuses going elsewhere… And then it slowly died [and]…there was that huge focus on numeracy and literacy…".

During this ebb in gifted and talented education at the school, the ECT petitioned the Principal to start something for these learners again. With a dropping roll in the senior classes, linked to a growing intermediate school across town, the Principal agreed that there would be some benefit to the school for an extension class for Year 7 and 8 students. Thus, the Enrichment Class, which was the school's sole official gifted and talented provision, was formed in 2013 and the ECT took on her current role as its teacher.

Each year, the Principal chose the students who would populate the class based on achievement data such as PAT scores. Little consultation took place regarding the class's composition during its three years of operation despite objections from the ECT. Though the ECT had no input into the class at any time, parents and whanau were consulted, at least to give permission for their children to be placed in the Enrichment Class. Parent responses such as "the school invited her" and "it was the school that suggested" imply they were part of the decision-making process. Additionally, in the third year (which is the year when the case study took place), the Principal allowed students to apply to be in the class.

In the same year that the Enrichment Class was formed, the SENCO took on her current role as the deputy principal and special education needs coordinator. In the first two years as SENCO, she focussed solely on priority learners – students with special needs, Māori and Pasifika students, students who are financially disadvantaged and students achieving below and well-below in National Standards. During this time, the ECT petitioned senior management to extend the gifted and talented provision to the whole school by reminding the SENCO that the gifted and talented "are also special needs children but we don't ever include them".

The SENCO agreed with the ECT who had "just kept chipping away at" the matter. She felt encouraged and supported by the ECT who said "I'll be there with you. We can do this together." She determined that not recognising the gifted and talented as priority learners was "not fair [and] we need a system back in place".

This decision led the SENCO to apply to the Ministry for school-wide PLD to increase the teachers' knowledge and skills in gifted and talented education. The Ministry-funded PLD, facilitated by an expert advisor from Te Toi Tupu, began in 2015. In the first year, the PLD focussed on understanding giftedness and talent and

identifying the gifted and talented. The advisor supported the ECT and SENCO to run sessions for the teaching staff.

The outside expertise was welcome. The ECT believed that the PLD sessions facilitated by an outside provider would prove "more successful than me" because some teachers questioned the ECT's ability to truly understand the pressures of an inclusive classroom since she taught an extension class. The SENCO likewise appreciated the advisor's presence in the school. She particularly valued the guidance, "motivation…courage and confidence which you need" to implement gifted and talented education.

Working collaboratively, the SENCO, ECT and advisor identified goals for the re-establishment of whole-school gifted and talented education. The 2015 goals were to develop appropriate policies and update identification procedures. The 2016 goal is to implement whole-school provisions for gifted and talented learners.

To support this goal, PLD will continue into 2016. The main focus will be developing the skills teachers need to effectively differentiate the curriculum and learning environment for gifted and talented learners.

The SENCO is confident that the teachers "now understand that it's time for us to get on board [with gifted and talented education]…and bring some sort of flavour into our school to cater for those children." Indeed, most teachers indicated that the 2015 PLD had raised their awareness and knowledge about giftedness and talent. They were not certain how to translate that into the classroom programmes, however. Questions such as "Where to now?" and "What we're gonna do about it?" often surfaced.

5.3 The School's Gifted and Talented Policy and Provision

The following sections will describe the school's updated policy and identification procedures as well as its current gifted and talented provisions and evaluation practices. It will also outline the planned expansion of provisions for 2016.

5.3.1 The Strategic Plan

The school's gifted and talented policy is embedded as a part of its 2015 to 2017 Strategic Plan in which the school has identified four Strategic Aims. To achieve these aims, the school has developed four Strategic Goals and the 2015 Annual Plan which itself contains a range of goals and targets to be met during the year.

Gifted and talented learners are explicitly mentioned numerous times in the second Strategic Aim and once in the Annual Plan. They are alluded to, as a part of students with special needs, in the fourth Strategic Goal and throughout the Annual Plan.

Specific procedures and targets for this group of students are not always evident in the school's Strategic Plan, however. Firstly, the fourth Strategic Goal details the school's accommodation of students with special educational needs as per the Ministry's Success for All initiative; however, gifted and talented learners are not overtly acknowledged. Secondly, most objectives in the Annual Plan similarly do not expressly mention gifted and talented learners. Furthermore, goals in the Annual Plan are indicated for only three subject areas. This does not take into account other areas of giftedness and talent that could be monitored. Moreover, some objectives in the Annual Plan omit gifted and talented learners almost entirely, referring only to underachieving students or students who had Individual Education Plans or teacher-aid support in place. None of the gifted and talented students in the Enrichment Class had such support in 2015.

5.3.2 The School's Rationale for Gifted and Talented Education

The SENCO stressed the importance of senior management's role of ensuring that the school meets its NAG 1 obligations. Moreover, she indicated that providing appropriate educational experiences for gifted and talented learners goes past a government mandate. "We don't just do things that we're told to, we should be doing things that are right by our children".

This sentiment was echoed by the teachers in the focus group who showed a desire to meet the needs of gifted and talented students in the best way possible. One teacher summed it up: "We've all got the same will…to see the best for our kids".

The importance of having effective policies and provisions in place for gifted and talented students is evident. There is an understanding that these students can often be perceived, by others and themselves, as different to the norm. Regardless, they need to feel accepted in the school. The ECT recalled that the children in the first year of the Enrichment Class "loved being weird and being weird together. And they just totally accepted it and for the first time, they just kind of all went, 'Ah. Nobody's laughing at me.'" Additionally, negative student outcomes were identified if policies and provisions were not effective. These included students feeling "bored", not meeting potential and displaying "naughty" behaviour.

5.3.3 The School's Definition of Giftedness and Talent

The school has no formal, school-wide definition of giftedness and talent. However, to facilitate identification, the ECT and SENCO updated the Looking Beyond identification form comprising a range of domains including all of the New Zealand Curriculum learning areas as well as other areas of giftedness and talent such as leadership. This form joined a number of other forms teachers used to identify and monitor their priority learners.

Despite the development of the identification form, it is evident that the school's staff and wider community struggled to conceptualise giftedness and talent. For instance, when asked to describe the characteristics of gifted and talented learners, teachers and parents identified 15 separate categories of academic, personality and socio-emotional traits. In particular, the school community puzzled over the terminology used in gifted and talented education, had misconceptions regarding the development of giftedness and talent, and were uncertain of how to quantify giftedness and talent.

The differing meanings of the words "gifted" and "talented" created confusion amongst the teachers in the focus group. The SENCO reported that "those two words…really cause[d] some trouble". Likewise the ECT indicated that the teachers had been "arguing over gifts or talents" in the PLD sessions. The teachers spent some time grappling with their meaning and usage during the interview. The teachers were especially uncertain of when to refer to a student's strength as a gift and when to refer to

it as a talent. Comments such as "I don't know whether to call it talent or giftedness" peppered the interview.

Linked to this uncertainty of the usage of gifted and talented is a misconception regarding the development of giftedness and talent. Three of the focus group teachers and one parent displayed dichotomous views of giftedness and talent. Abilities were referred to as either "natural" and "inborn" or "learned".

Teachers also expressed uncertainty regarding how advanced students should be, relative to their peers, in order to be considered gifted and talented. The SENCO noted that teachers wanted a rubric to help them quantify "how much better" learners should be in order to be identified. The teachers wanted a baseline so they could differentiate between the very bright and the gifted and talented. As one teacher expressed, "Just because they're academically bright doesn't make them an Einstein of science or whatever...I can't get my head around that still".

The SENCO is aware of the perplexity regarding the definition. She is hopeful, nonetheless, that as they journey together "working through [our] gifted and talented process, the definition [will be] born".

5.3.4 The School's Identification of Gifted and Talented Students

This section describes how students outside of the Enrichment Class were identified as gifted and talented. It also examines teachers' concerns with the process.

The school-wide identification of gifted and talented learners in the other classrooms took place in Term 4. Based on various data, teachers completed the aforesaid identification form during a staff meeting. Standard academic test results were used to identify students working well above peers. The school used holistic methods as well. Teachers mentioned observing students in creative challenges, discussions with parents and whanau, allowing students to self-report and listening in on peer conversations. Some teachers also mentioned using more instinctual methods of identification. To these teachers, giftedness and talent can be "self-evident" – learners "sparkle" or may display an ability "that ain't normal".

The gathering of holistic evidence was not explicitly planned to identify giftedness and talent. Rather, it seemed to spring from teachers' individual responsiveness to their students versus a school-wide, intentional identification method.

Some teachers viewed the holistic and intuitive approaches as advantageous because some areas of giftedness and talent do not fit easily into standard academic testing. One teacher responded, "Sometimes not always having a checkpoint list is a healthier way to go…" because it is less predetermined. Teachers generally agreed that rigid identification methods could be restrictive; however, most teachers saw the benefit in using a checklist as well to help ensure all gifted and talented learners were identified and thus catered for appropriately.

Two teachers expressed concern about the necessity of an additional form to complete. One teacher thought that giftedness and talent was "just really obvious" to identify and was confident that she could differentiate her instruction appropriately as abilities and needs arose. She thought the identification would "polarise" groups of children and that the way forward should be to "do something that we can allow them all to be…individuals, unique. Every child has a gift or talent, surely". The other teacher was concerned that completing another form would not be an effective way to assist teachers in catering for the diversity in the classroom. She questioned,

> how do we marry all of this stuff up and make sense of it all without just filling in forms and more forms and more forms so we satisfy the piece of paper but are we really making a difference?

After the staff meeting in which teachers completed the identification form, the SENCO collated the data and created the Gifted and Talented Register. Thirty-nine students, just over 10% of the student population, were identified as gifted and talented. She is confident that more students will be identified as PLD continues into 2016.

She hopes this will be especially true of students in the bilingual unit of whom none were identified by their teachers as gifted or talented. The bilingual team teachers thought that all of their students were talented. The SENCO has challenged this notion and expects the teachers to review their decisions and identify gifted and talented learners from the unit.

5.3.5 The School's Provision of Gifted and Talented Education

This section describes how the school went about providing for the needs of the gifted and talented students, particularly those in the Enrichment Class. It further details the school's future plans.

School-wide Coordination

At the time of the study, the ECT informally took on aspects of a gifted and talented coordinator's role by consulting with and advising staff. She communicated extension opportunities, such as competitions, to other teachers and supported teachers who approached her for assistance with children they suspected were gifted and talented.

Official school-wide coordination began as mentioned above. The SENCO intends to continue to share leadership with the Te Toi Tupu advisor and the ECT as PLD continues and changes to school-wide provision occur in 2016. The ECT and SENCO will work together to organise cluster groupings of gifted and talented learners with appropriate teachers. This will be discussed further below.

The SENCO also plans to release the ECT to take up the role of gifted and talented coordinator in 2016. This will give her time to expand on the support she has already provided, work with gifted and talented students, and manage administrative duties.

Community Involvement

The school makes information available to parents in typical ways – newsletters, blogs, websites, and school reports. Similarly, parental involvement is typical of many schools – permission for education outside of the classroom (EOTC) events and parent-teacher interviews. Furthermore, the ECT indicated that she frequently communicates with parents via text. This type of information tends to flow out from the school. Information-seeking is not as evident.

Some consultation with parents and whanau has occurred, however. Senior management recently distributed a survey regarding the changes in the learning environment to take place in 2016. Also, the bilingual unit holds whanau huis every term. This type of consultation did not extend to the updates in the school's gifted and talented policy though.

The SENCO plans to make parent consultation a feature of the gifted and talented register in 2016. Each child in the register will have a narrative including information from parents and whanau. She sees this as invaluable to identification as well as to adding to the human resources bank for the school.

Parents are welcome and encouraged to help in learning activities across the school. This includes providing enrichment through such activities as harakeke weaving or playing the ukulele. Parents also support with extracurricular activities and EOTC events. Four of the parents indicated their willingness to be more involved in school activities.

The SENCO noted that student voice was not used school-wide to inform the gifted and talented policy but intends to incorporate its use into the school in coming years. The ECT did, however, use some student voice in the classroom. All students indicated that there were some opportunities to co-construct classroom rules and routines. They all also indicated that some student choice was available for the types of assignments and assessments that were completed.

The ECT also regularly utilises the wider community. Members of the public have been invited to visit the classroom. Examples include a mother of a soldier killed in Afghanistan, an old boy of the school, who assisted with an inquiry into the war and a London Blitz survivor who spoke to the children about his experiences. The ECT also uses EOTC which is described in more detail below.

Current Classroom Provisions

The following section outlines the workings of the Enrichment Classroom and details provisions in the rest of the school.

Enrichment Classroom

Teaching and learning in the Enrichment Classroom is described in this section as well as barriers to effective provision for this class.

Differentiated Learning

A qualitatively differentiated learning environment is evident in the Enrichment Class. The class is the top stream of the intermediate classes in which the ECT has set high expectations of student effort and achievement. The students tend to be highly motivated to learn as they work with like-minded peers. But the ECT found that this environment was often a jump in expectation for the students who had come from mixed-ability classrooms where they may not have been overly extended. "When my kids come in here, they're breaking that, 'I'm done, what do I do?' mentality".

The streamed class also allows students to work at a clip as a group. The ECT has found that the students bring their "prior knowledge or can quickly develop their knowledge…[I] don't have to explain a whole concept".

Differentiated Curriculum

Though the students have been placed in the class based on their advanced achievement, there still exists a range of abilities across the learning areas. The ECT differentiates instruction through individualised learning. She often uses rubrics with varying types of activities that are based on Gardner's Multiple Intelligence theory and Bloom's Taxonomy. The activities range in complexity from lower-order thinking tasks to higher-order. The ECT uses the range of learning activities to allow students choice based on interest and level of challenge.

Student understanding of their preferred learning styles and intelligences is evident. For instance, most students (n=6) identified kinaesthetic learning as a preferred style and two students mentioned they prefer a quiet working environment. Each of the students identified at least three personal learning styles or preferences. In all, ten learning styles and preferences were identified by the students.

The ECT further individualises instruction by allowing students to travel through the curriculum at their own pace. "I do let them go. I assess them at what they're truly producing". For instance, she sees "no harm in them writing at a Level 5 level because that's just making them a better writer". Furthermore, two parents commented that they appreciate this aspect of the teaching and learning, one of whom mentioned that her daughter was working from a Year 10-level maths book.

Moreover, the ECT strives to know her students, their family and whanau and their background so she can incorporate that knowledge into the learning environment.

Most students (n=6) indicated that the teacher was aware of their background, culture and interests. The same students indicated that the teacher incorporated this information into the learning environment. This aspect is further described below.

Parents positively commented on the ECT's pedagogical approach and its benefit to their children. They described the ECT as "caring", "passionate" and "appropriately critical". The benefits for their children were described in phrases such as "confidence she didn't have before", "true potential" and "ownership of her own learning".

Learning Activities

The ECT utilises a range of learning activities to engage students. She is particularly motivated to provide practical, hands-on activities. The students confirmed that they did or said things more than they wrote things in the classroom. Practical activities extended into real-world learning opportunities such as EOTC. All of the students and half of the parents mentioned the use of EOTC. The classroom provided further evidence. For instance, appropriate gear for camping was on display as the class prepared for an upcoming excursion.

It is evident that the ETC weaves EOTC prominently through her teaching and learning. For example, she recounted that

> our living world focus is New Zealand and evolution. We're going to stay the night in the bush and stuff like that…So, we do go out and about. Like, for our statistics, we did a beach clean-up… But, I'd do that in a mainstream class. I haven't changed my teaching.

Another prominent feature of the ECT's pedagogy is linking the current learning activities with the one to come. One method of achieving this was to ensure that as the students work at higher curriculum levels, the topics covered in the classroom would not be duplicated in a Year 9 classroom. The ECT does not want "them to be bored" so she looks through the Year 9 curriculum from the local high school to make sure she covers different topics.

She has also made contact with teachers at the high school to ascertain their expectations of new Year 9 pupils. She found that many of the high school teachers expect the students to do things, such as copying off the board, which may not be

typically taught at intermediate level. She sees this as "setting these kids up for failure" and hence has added some of these skills into the classroom. Two parents specifically appreciated this feature of the teaching and learning viewing it as good preparation for high school.

Assessment

The ECT utilises standard assessment tests to monitor student progress, but has found they can be limiting. She noted that they are "always capped. You know, like their reading runs out at 15.5 years". She finds assessing student progress via the aforementioned rubrics to more accurately reflect their progress. Other assessment approaches include student self- and peer-assessment, use of pre-tests, and both oral and written feedback. Evidence of these assessment approaches can be seen in that all of the students indicated that they have opportunities to discuss their work with the teacher and that the teacher gathered prior knowledge via pre-tests. Furthermore, one parent noted that the work was "marked to a high standard with the children given detailed reports at the end of each thing".

The ECT further noted how important written feedback was to the students. "These kids want feedback and they want it now. And, oral feedback is often not good enough… They would like to have their next learning steps and they'd like to be assessed against the rubric thank you very much".

Barriers to Provision

The first barrier the ECT identified that hampered her ability to provide effective gifted and talented education is the fear of standing out too much. Her students are often in the school newsletters and are school representatives at various inter-school competitions such as Mathex and LitQuiz. She feels the pressure not to "celebrate it because it's kind of like showing off".

Another barrier is other teachers' misconceptions about her role. She reported that some teachers have made comments that she has "an easy job" because she's got the top stream of students. She thinks that to keep "differentiation going and working at their level and getting that higher order thinking is a lot of work".

Adding to the tension is senior management's lack of support for other classes participating with the Enrichment Class EOTC events. There seemed to be an awkward

juxtaposition of meeting gifted and talented learners' real needs whilst not creating unequal advantages and opportunities for those not in the class. The ECT's understanding was "it's kind of okay if it's just me but if I pull in anybody else it becomes unfair". A parent also noticed this tension, stating "My only concern with this class, [is] I feel it can make the other classes feel less superior to the enrichment class which can sometimes cause difficulties".

Whole-School

There is evidence that the other teachers were providing some differentiation for students who "shine". This included extension activities, opportunities to work with like-minded peers and using a range of activities to allow giftedness and talent to emerge. Some differentiated learning opportunities occurred within classrooms whilst others presented from across the school. Whole-school opportunities included competition, sports and cultural events.

There is no evidence of a plan in place for specifically meeting the needs of potentially gifted and talented students through these opportunities. Rather, there is an ad-hoc nature to these provisions.

Intentions for Future Provisions

This last section regarding provisions describes the school's plan for improved school-wide provision and concludes with teachers' concerns about the changes.

Cluster Groups in Inclusive Classrooms

Changes are already afoot that the SENCO hopes will boost school-wide provisions. All children will be placed in inclusive, mainstream classes. The SENCO and ECT will use information from the register to cluster gifted and talented students throughout these classes. They will be matched with teachers who will provide an appropriate teaching and learning environment according to student strengths and needs.

The ECT has some concerns, however, regarding class composition. Previously, class composition had been based on creating equity – special needs and "behaviour"

children had been distributed equally amongst the classrooms. She does not think this will be a positive approach for including gifted and talented students. "I think [if] they're just spread, maybe one or two in each class, they just get used as a model". Thus, she wants to ensure that gifted and talented learners are in groups of at least five students.

The classroom lists will be created before the end of the 2015 school year and the register information made available to the teachers. The SENCO expects the teachers to provide inclusive, qualitatively differentiated learning environments and wants the teachers to have enough time to carefully consider students' individual differences and plan accordingly.

The school is planning to slowly implement modern learning environments. Specifically, senior management plans to incorporate flexible, team teaching approaches and potentially create large open spaces with smaller break-out rooms. The SENCO will investigate how to make timetable and staffing changes to allow teachers with expertise in certain areas to work with students from across the school who are, or show potential to be, gifted and talented in those areas. Further, the SENCO wants to make changes that allow the teachers more "time to think really deeply about their children and their programmes".

The SENCO wants cultural backgrounds and understandings to be a part of the teachers' consideration and planning. She is mindful that Māori and Pasifika learners may think differently about school and their sense of belonging within it and the wider community. She further exhibits an understanding that some Māori and Pasifika children may perceive certain activities as "a bit whakama" – embarrassing and shameful – and that they may not "put themselves up there" which is often considered whakahihi. She identified that some students need culturally safe environments in order to "shine". She also wants to ensure that the school accommodates for learners from a range of backgrounds who may all feel that "their culture is precious to them".

Teachers' Concerns

Most teachers in the focus group were unsure of how they would effectively meet the diverse needs of their students. Two teachers questioned their own ability to extend gifted and talented learners, as one teacher remarked, "We can extend them in

[some] areas, but I can't always extend them in those others". The teachers were further concerned about how the school would collectively provide for the needs of the gifted and talented. They were not sure how the school's structure could change enough to cater for the full range of giftedness and talent. They wondered how the flexible groupings would work, how teachers would be released to work in the various interest groups and if outside providers would need to come in because they did not collectively have enough time or expertise to cope with all the varying gifts and talents.

The teachers in the focus group also expressed concern regarding the school's obligation to meet such diverse needs. Some teachers noted that the school did not have the resources or the time take on full ownership for every gift and talent. Thus, parents would need to take some of the responsibility. As one teacher asserted, "We can only do so much. I think the parents have a big role to play when it comes to gifted and talented".

This led to concerns regarding equity because the teachers recognised that some children did not have access to the same level of opportunities as others outside of school due to their socio-economic backgrounds. The teachers agreed that opportunities need to be equitable, but they were uncertain of the extent of the school's responsibility.

Additionally, there is evidence that the teachers were feeling pressure to meet unrealistic expectations. With a third of the students already being priority learners, the teachers were beginning to feel pulled from either end of the spectrum of ability. This is highlighted in another teacher's comment, "There's going to be that disparity between this huge bottom end where we do have pressure to move up…in comparison to these ones that might be there for certain things". Another teacher predicted that the gifted and talented programme would "end up in a heap" because teachers in one classroom could not meet the national requirements for under-achieving students and extend the gifted and talented effectively as well. Two other teachers, rather tongue-in-cheek, wondered if they were "naughty" or "bad" if they could not meet expectations.

5.4 The School's Self-Review of Gifted and Talented Education

The school's Annual Plan and Strategic Aims indicate that the school and its Board take a comprehensive approach to self-review. Review areas include the school

charter, policies, curriculum, targeted and special needs student outcomes, teacher PLD and appraisal goals, and how strategic aims impact each classroom. However, there is no evidence that on-going review and evaluation procedures are in place for gifted and talented learners.

Despite this lack of an official self-review policy, the ECT does review the provision in the Enrichment Class in consultation with students and parents. Students are offered opportunities to complete surveys on the teaching and learning in the Enrichment Class. Parents similarly have opportunities to discuss and comment upon the teaching and learning in the classroom.

Both the SENCO and ECT noted that formal and appropriate evaluation procedures are necessary and should be put into place for gifted and talented learners. To assist in the review process, the SENCO will prioritise these students in 2016 and will have their outcomes monitored.

5.5 Chapter Summary

The school's gifted and talented education has ebbed and flowed in the last decade. It is currently advancing with developing practices in terms of policy, PLD and identification procedures. The future plans indicate further improvements in whole-school provisions and the school's self-review. Concerns regarding the future intentions were evident.

Chapter 6: Discussion

6.1 Introduction

This section will discuss the major findings of this research in relation to the literature. The study took place as the school was re-establishing school-wide gifted and talented policies and provisions. The school was moving away from a narrow understanding of giftedness and talent to a multi-faceted understanding. Likewise, the school plans to expand its limited school-wide provisions to better cater for students throughout the school. The expansion is due in large part to the senior management's understanding that gifted and talented students have special educational needs that require prioritisation. This recognition led senior management to actively remove barriers to gifted and talented education in the school.

6.2 School Policies

The school's recent response to gifted and talented students echoes the nationwide "growing awareness and acknowledgement of the needs of gifted and talented learners in schools" (Riley & Bicknell, 2013, Supporting Identification and Provisions section, para. 5). School guidelines were updated in the year of the study to include gifted and talented students. The update was underpinned by the unwritten rationale that all gifted and talented students in the school deserve to be recognised and be offered appropriate learning opportunities. Furthermore, gifted and talented learners were included in the school's charter as a part of the strategic and annual plans for students with special needs. The policy adaptations reveal a developing understanding of giftedness and talent, and somewhat aligns with Riley and Bicknell's (2013) findings that 59.4% of schools reported specific policies in place, 56.1% had a rationale supporting the policy and 56.4% identified goals for gifted and talented learners.

The school had produced written official guidelines which the Ministry (2012) has identified as a way to assist "schools to establish comprehensive and enduring

approaches" (p. 16). However, the goals and procedures in the annual plan did not fully correspond to the needs of these students as a unique group of students with special education needs. To be effective, these guidelines must explicitly respond to the needs of gifted and talented learners (Riley, 2012), which was not always the case in this school's policies and procedures, both written and unwritten.

6.3 School Identification

The SENCO and ECT re-established the use of an identification form and gifted and talented register. The identification form showed a multi-categorical understanding of giftedness and talent. Riley and Bicknell (2013) found that 81.7% of schools reported formal identification methods in place. The majority of schools (95%) identified learners with academic and intellectual gifts and talents. More than two-thirds of schools also identified learners in other areas of giftedness and talent such as arts, physicality, creativity, and leadership.

Less than half (47.3%) of the schools in Riley and Bicknell's (2013) study reported the identification of culture-specific gifts and talents. The identification form used in this school also may not have shown appropriate multicultural understandings of giftedness and talent. No gifted and talented students were identified from the bilingual unit, whereas thirty-nine learners were identified from the remaining students. This area was identified as an area of review and development by the SENCO.

Riley (2012) asserts that identification processes in New Zealand schools are not culturally appropriate. When identification processes are not multicultural, students from non-Western cultures are at risk of being missed (Riley & Sturgess, 2005; Scobie-Jennings, 2013). This is evident in New Zealand as Māori learners are underrepresented in gifted and talented education (Cathcart & Pou, 2010; Webber, 2011). Keen (2005) found that Māori and Pasifika students "were identified as gifted and talented at about half the rate for New Zealand Europeans and Asians" (p. 213). Jenkins et al. (2010) put this down, in part, to culturally inappropriate identification methods.

Other groups of learners can also be underrepresented if the identification procedures are too narrow. Students may be overlooked if they show maladjustive behaviours (Wellisch et al., 2011) or underachieve (Anthony et al., 2002; Russell &

Riley, 2011). This is also true of students from lower socio-economic backgrounds (Ballam, 2016; Keen, 2005).

Thus, literature strongly suggests that schools employ a variety of formal and informal identification methods to ensure students from all backgrounds and cultures, as well as those with gifts outside of the traditional academic areas, are included as gifted and talented (Anthony et al., 2002; Joy, 2006; Margrain, 2010; Ministry of Education, 2012; Moltzen, 2004; Renzulli, 2002; Riley et al., 2004; Russell & Riley, 2011). The whole-school identification in my case study was based on teacher nomination informed by their observations as well as formative and summative data. This suggests triangulation of identification methods. This is a shift away from the earlier identification procedure that relied solely on summative data in traditional academic areas. It is also inclusive of the whole-staff instead of one senior manager.

6.4 School Provision

The gifted and talented provision in the year of the study officially consisted of only one intermediate (Year 7 and 8), streamed classroom. The school plans to increase their provision to include gifted and talented students from across the school. As well as broadening its definition of giftedness and talent by recognising a range of domain areas, the expanded provision allows the school to cater for students at all year levels, from New Entrant to Year 8. The Enrichment Class will be disbanded and gifted and talented learners will be clustered according to year level. The cluster groups will be matched to teachers who can best meet their collective needs. This is a shift from the current segregated approach to an inclusive and more responsive approach.

Most New Zealand schools use ability grouping in an inclusive classroom for a large portion of their gifted and talented provision (Riley et al., 2004; Riley & Bicknell, 2013). Moltzen (2006) argues that an appropriately inclusive learning environment can be effective for gifted and talented learners. Particularly, an inclusive environment can allow a variety of giftedness to emerge, whereas a segregated approach typically only sees the more traditional gifted areas being catered for. Furthermore, New Zealand research also indicates that gifted and talented students can benefit from ability grouping in mainstream classrooms (Bourne & Sturgess, 2006; Margrain et al., 2013).

Some educators, however, contend that a segregated approach is more appropriate because the regular classroom can be too restrictive (Gagne, 2007; Moltzen, 2006). Additional New Zealand research suggests that gifted and talented students working in streamed classes, instead of in mixed-ability classes, are positively benefited in both primary and secondary contexts (Hornby & Witte, 2014; Hornby et al., 2011). Bate et al. (2012) strongly advocate for gifted and talented students to learn only with like-minded peers in withdrawal programs.

Future provisions for the school tend toward the middle of these two arguments. The ECT wants in-class cluster groups to consist of at least five students and flexible groupings across the classrooms will be based on interest and ability. These plans allow students ample opportunity to work with like-minded peers in an inclusive environment.

At the time of the study, the school unofficially provided a range of whole-school and classroom-based opportunities to allow some students outside of the Enrichment Class to work in their areas of strengths and interests with cultural understandings evident. However, there is little evidence to suggest that these opportunities were intentionally planned to meet the needs of identified gifted and talented students, or to allow exceptionality to emerge from those with potential, in a structured, continuous way. While the school did respond to the needs of the gifted and talented learners as they arose, the response was seemingly improvised for students outside of the Enrichment Class.

Inclusive classrooms that take a responsive, learner-centred approach to teaching and learning are common in New Zealand, particularly in primary contexts (Moltzen, 2004). Culturally responsive, learner-centred environments can provide spaces in which gifted and talented learners flourish (Bevan-Brown, 2005; Education Review Office, 2008b; Jenkins et al., 2010; Ministry of Education, 2012; Niwa, 2010; Riley et al., 2004; Scobie-Jennings, 2013; Webber, 2011). Moltzen (2004) asserts that, even without training in gifted and talented education, teachers who recognise students' individual strengths, needs and interests and then plan the teaching and learning accordingly, will cater appropriately for gifted and talented learners. Thus, a culturally responsive learning environment can go a long way toward meeting the needs of the gifted and talented (Fraser, 2013).

Whilst this may be the case, if the planning does not adequately examine individual differences, gifted and talented education may be ad hoc in nature. As was

found in this study, this type of educational environment can lead to learning opportunities that are fragmented "one-off" projects or programmes that lack continuity (Robinson, 2009); learning and achievement that occurs by happenstance (Bate et al., 2012; Grant, 2013); or an education that is not qualitatively differentiated appropriately (Riley et al., 2004). Thus considered planning is of great import to ensure that provisions for gifted and talented learners are coherent and intentional.

This is especially true when the gifted and talented education takes place in inclusive classrooms. Though Moltzen (2006) asserts it is possible to appropriately meet gifted and talented learners' needs in an inclusive environment, he also contends that "successful inclusion of learners with special needs requires more than minor adaptations" (Moltzen, 2004, p. 141). Rowley (2003) further posits that the teaching and learning environment required for gifted and talented education is markedly different to that of a regular classroom (cited in Riley & Sturgess, 2005). Therefore, an essential element of inclusive education is the careful consideration and planning for a diverse range of students. The SENCO has identified this as an area of improvement for 2016. She plans to provide the teachers with clarity regarding planning expectations and to make additional time available for teachers to plan.

6.5 Leadership Engagement and Overall Coordination

Principals and senior managers have significant influence over the gifted and talented provisions in their schools (Apted et al., 2007; Keen, 2005). Their knowledge about current understandings of and issues in gifted and talented education, as well as their commitment to providing equitable educational opportunities for all of their students are important factors in the effective provision of gifted and talented education in schools (Education Review Office, 2008b; Riley et al., 2004). Thus, they must help shape the overall direction for gifted and talented education in the school (Bush, 2011; Clark, 2014; Lewis, Cruzeiro, & Hall, 2007; Riley et al., 2004).

In the year of this study, leadership support had increased from that of previous years. The SENCO pushed for change by organising the whole-school PLD, adding gifted and talented into school policy and re-establishing the use of an identification form as well as gifted and talented register. She also employed a shared leadership

approach by working with the ECT and the Te Toi Tupu advisor which she intends to continue into the next year.

Additionally, the SENCO wants teachers to also take ownership of the gifted and talented education in their classrooms. Effectively, the SENCO wants to shift the locus of control from one or two leaders to school-wide leadership. Though the coordination will be centralised, through PLD and structural changes, the SENCO wants to create a more flexible and culturally responsive learning environment in which teachers have the knowledge, understandings and skills required to effectively cater for all of their students. This is a major shift in leadership style away from a time when one senior manager held the control for gifted and talented education in the school.

The SENCO's collaborative approach has been widely identified as an important element of successful and sustained gifted and talented education in schools (Education Review Office, 2008b; Riley et al., 2004). Sustainability is likely to suffer if one person is solely responsible for gifted and talented education in a school. One staff member can be overloaded by the responsibility (Keen, 2005). Further, staff turnover may result in the one person in charge and enthusiastic about gifted and talented education leaving the school and thus the loss of provision as well (Riley et al., 2004). Moreover, if only a principal is in charge of coordination, then the provision is reliant on that principal's priorities which may be influenced by their time, energy and attitude toward gifted and talented education (Clark, 2014; Lewis et al., 2007).

Conversely, team approaches effectively provide for the needs of gifted and talented learners (Keen, 2005). Apted et al.'s (2007) study revealed the importance of shared leadership. Principals considered a collaborative style and the delegation of duties to their staff essential to building an effective gifted and talented programme. The staff from the schools indicated that they felt empowered and trusted to meet the needs of their gifted and talented students. Riley and Moltzen (2011) further report that collaborative styles of reviewing a school's gifted and talented provisions can lead to empowered teachers and sustainable programmes.

As a part of her shared leadership approach, the SENCO plans to release the ECT from some classroom time so that the ECT can return to a coordination role. Lewis et al. (2007) urge principals to empower a staff member to take on the role of gifted and talented coordinator. This relieves the pressure on senior management as a

coordinator can provide the role modelling, coaching and specific guidance for other staff (Apted et al., 2007).

Russell and Riley (2011) further assert the importance of this role in a school as it "is central to the introduction, implementation, development, success and sustainability of the programme" (para. 22). Thus, the person in the role as gifted and talented education coordinator should be both passionate about giftedness and talent and highly knowledgeable about the principles and practices of gifted and talented education (Riley & Sturgess, 2005). The ECT displayed these characteristics during the study. She showed persistent concern and enthusiasm for gifted and talented education in the school as well a variety of good practices in her work with the Enrichment Class. She provided a responsive learning environment with a qualitatively differentiated curriculum that saw adaptations to the learning in terms of the content of the learning, the learning processes and the products generated. She also evaluated the teaching and learning in formal and informal ways.

6.6 Barriers to Provision

The senior management's increased engagement with gifted and talented education in the school has seen the removal of some barriers to its effective provision. They have done this by updating school guidelines, broadening the school's definition and identification processes, sharing leadership and expanding provision to the whole school.

6.6.1 Professional Learning and Development

Another barrier that the school has addressed is access to gifted and talented PLD which is also a crucial component for appropriate provision. The teachers in this study had finished the first year of a two-year, whole-school PLD programme. The teachers were positive about the PLD and recognised a need to continue to develop their knowledge and gather more classroom-specific strategies to better accommodate gifted and talented students in their classrooms.

Training and support empowers and enables teachers to provide appropriate gifted and talented education. International and New Zealand studies have found that training improves teachers' ability to qualitatively differentiate the curriculum and provide positive and stimulating classroom environments for gifted and talented learners (Bourne & Sturgess, 2006; Riley & Sturgess, 2005). Te Toi Tupu (2016), the Ministry's gifted and talented PLD provider that worked with the school in this study, consistently report that schools show significant progress toward achieving positive outcomes for their gifted and talented students as a result of the PLD provided. Furthermore, teachers in Watters' (2013) study were statistically less likely to be resistant to gifted and talented education after engaging in PLD.

Because pre-service training in gifted and talented education is limited (Moltzen, 2011c; Riley & Sturgess, 2005; Tapper & Riley, 2015; Watters, 2013), teachers need access to in-service training and opportunities to network with other schools which can increase teacher knowledge and allow for the sharing of resources (Apted et al., 2007; Bush, 2011; Keen, 2005; Margrain et al., 2013; Riley, 2003b; Riley et al., 2004). Teachers need training and networking opportunities that will help them to appropriately respond to the individuality of the children in their classrooms (Cathcart, 2005; Riley, 2012; Riley & Sturgess, 2005); provide culturally-appropriate learning environments (Bevan-Brown, 2005; Macfarlane, 2010; Rymarczyk Hyde, 2010; Scobie-Jennings, 2013); differentiate the curriculum (Anthony et al., 2002; Riley & Sturgess, 2005; Watters, 2013); and, evaluate the effectiveness of their provision (Moltzen, 2006; Riley & Sturgess, 2005). PLD of this nature will equip teachers with the skills and knowledge necessary to effectively adapt the learning environment for gifted and talented learners.

Teacher Self-efficacy

Though the teachers in this study had participated in gifted and talented PLD, the PLD sessions had not yet addressed the "how to" of qualitative differentiation. It is here that a tension point is revealed – teacher self-efficacy. Doubts regarding either personal or collective self-efficacy were evident in the data from the focus group. One teacher questioned her ability to qualitatively differentiate for gifted and talented

students. Most teachers wondered if the school as a whole would be able to cater for the diverse range of special needs of their gifted and talented learners.

This search revealed only one study specifically discussing teacher self-efficacy regarding gifted and talented education. In their examination of an instrument designed to measure teachers' attitudes toward acceleration, Rambo and McCoach (2012) found that the most important factor in a teacher's decision to recommend acceleration for a gifted and talented student was the teacher's self-efficacy to do so. New Zealand research regarding acceleration further suggests a link between self-efficacy and acceleration. Kirby and Townsend (2005) argue that teachers can feel threatened by gifted and talented learners. This can make them resistant to accepting accelerated students in their classrooms (Wardman, 2009).

Additional literature adds weight to the notion that educators may question their self-efficacy in terms of gifted and talented education. Half of the case study schools in Riley et al.'s (2004) study reported concerns regarding teacher competency particularly in identification. They also report that numerous teachers commented on their own lack of knowledge and skills to provide for the needs of the gifted and talented in regular classrooms.

Uncertainty regarding teacher expertise can furthermore be seen in the way schools are calling for increased access to PLD (Riley & Bicknell, 2013; Riley & Sturgess, 2005). PLD was identified as a top priority by 38% of schools in Riley's (2003b) study. Apted et al. (2007) and Keen (2005) found that schools similarly prioritised PLD. The teachers who took part in Watters's (2013) professional development programme saw enough benefit to their expertise and practice that they recommended that whole-staff PLD be made available in their schools.

Conceptualising Giftedness and Talent

PLD must also help teachers develop a sound understanding of the concept of giftedness and talent. Difficulties conceptualising giftedness and talent is another tension point for the teachers in this study. No school-wide definition of giftedness and talent had been established which left the teachers in the focus group grappling with the definition and the terminology used. Because there is no national definition of

giftedness and talent, schools must define what their local school community considers to be giftedness and talent (Ministry of Education, 2012). The Ministry provides no specific definition, "but rather provides schools and teachers with a wide range of options" (Moltzen, 2011c, p. 17). Riley (2002) contends that the Ministry's lack of prescription is appropriate for two reasons – there is no internationally-accepted definition and New Zealand has a diverse population. With limited training, however, the wide range of options can seem nebulous to educators and leads to inconsistent national provision (Tapper, 2012).

The teachers in the focus group also showed uncertainty of how giftedness and talent develops and how advanced a student should be to be considered gifted and talented. In the literature, there is no consensus regarding a starting point for giftedness and talent, though authors agree that gifted and talented individuals must be exceptional (Moltzen, 2004; Tapper, 2012). Sheely and Silverman (2007) argue that exceptionality starts at an IQ of 115. Professor Gagné (2007) similarly asserts that the giftedness and talent spectrum begins an IQ of 120 which is the top 10% of intelligence. His understanding of giftedness and talent is much broader than just intelligence, though; he contends that the top 10% should be considered in a range of natural giftings and developed talents. Professor Renzulli's (2002) understanding is likewise multifaceted. However, he believes that up to the top 20% of learners could be gifted across a range of areas, but they must display the gifted behaviours of above-average ability, task commitment and creativity to be gifted and talented.

Additionally, as mentioned above, the policies reveal that the SENCO may have some misconceptions regarding the unique needs of gifted and talented students. Educators must be aware of a wide range of attributes when identifying giftedness and talent and catering for it in schools. Indeed, there is an abundance of differing combinations of traits that make individuals gifted and talented. These characteristics include:

- advanced cognitive ability (Anthony et al., 2002; Bevan-Brown, 2005; Gagne, 2007; Keen, 2006; Kirby & Townsend, 2005; Margrain, 2010; Moltzen, 2011a; Munro, 2013; Renzulli, 2002; Revel Sheely & Kreger Silverman, 2007);
- domain-specific giftedness and talent (Bicknell, 2006; Gagne, 2007; Joy, 2006; Niederer et al., 2003; Tapper, 2012);
- a variety of preferred learning styles (Joy, 2006; Keen, 2005);

- differing cultural understandings, even of the same trait (Bevan-Brown, 2010b; Cathcart & Pou, 2010; Frengley-Vaipuna, 2007; Frengley-Vaipuna et al., 2011, 2011; Jenkins et al., 2010; Mahaki & Mahaki, 2010; Ministry of Education, 2012; Niwa, 2010; Tapper, 2012; Webber, 2011);
- and, a large variety of socio-emotional characteristics (Bate et al., 2012; J. Blackett & Hermansson, 2005; R. Blackett & Webb, 2011; Cathcart, 2005; Dixon et al., 2006; Gallagher, 2011; Keen, 2005, 2006; Kirby & Townsend, 2005; Luscombe & Riley, 2001; Moltzen, 2011a; Needham, 2012; Revel Sheely & Kreger Silverman, 2007).

How can one *not* expect educators, with limited access to training, to be perplexed by the concepts and ramifications of gifted and talented education?

Egalitarian Views

PLD is also charged with tackling another barrier to gifted and talented education – egalitarian beliefs. The New Zealand education system is based on egalitarian views (Anthony et al., 2002; Moltzen, 2011c; Rawlins, 2004). Indeed, most New Zealand educators tend toward egalitarianism which means that teachers are expected to treat students equally and fairly. This conception of fairness is a major factor that has led to the inclusive education system in place in New Zealand (Bourne & Sturgess, 2006). These egalitarian views have been identified as a barrier to effective gifted and talented education, though (Riley, 2002).

This is another tension point for the teachers in the focus group who voiced equity concerns. They questioned how fair the educational system is for "average", non-prioritised students as more students become prioritised. This aligns with the typical view that gifted and talented education is elitist. Educators in New Zealand tend to believe that gifted are already advantaged, so they should not be offered anything that promotes that advantage (Anthony et al., 2002; Moltzen, 2011c; Ward, 2005).

Cathcart (2005) contends that elitist views regarding gifted and talented education are based on the notion that gifted and talented learners are receiving something special that is being denied to other learners (Cathcart, 2005). This may be due to a perception that the best education happens in gifted and talented education.

Results from Hornby and Witte (2014) and Hornby et al.'s (2011) New Zealand studies suggest that students in lower-ability classes may receive subpar teaching and learning opportunities due, in part, to the lower expectations teachers may hold for these students. Bevan-Brown (2012) also notes low expectations, particularly of Māori learners. She urges schools to ensure that the quality of teaching is excellent regardless of the ability grouping (Bevan-Brown, 2010a). Wardman (2009) further cautions that "as long as the best education happens in the gifted and talented program and the less than the best education happens in regular classrooms, gifted education is viewed as a prize" (p. 34).

Proponents of gifted and talented education reject the notion that it is a prize. Rather, it is viewed as a basic requirement for gifted and talented learners. Borland (2012) asserts that, as learners with special educational needs, gifted and talented students "require special-educational provisions if they are to receive the effective education to which they are entitled" (cited in Riley, 2012, p. 197). Cathcart (2005) argues that all children should be assessed, have their needs and abilities analysed, and have appropriate learning plans put in place. Likewise, Ward (2005) views equality as a recognition of student needs and developing talent regardless of where on the spectrum of ability students may start.

In this study, the teachers speculated upon the school's ability to provide equitably for all gifted and talented learners. They wondered about how fair it would be to some students, particularly of lower socio-economic status, if the school could not provide opportunities for all of the different ways in which children can be gifted and talented.

Like any other group, gifted and talented learners, do not comprise a homogenous group. Unique individuals differ in the intensity of giftedness, areas of ability, personal traits, and socio-cultural and socio-economic backgrounds (Ballam, 2016; Gagne, 2007; Keen, 2006; Rawlins, 2004; Riley et al., 2004). Thus, learning opportunities *should* vary within gifted and talented education to ensure equity. For instance, gifted and talented students from the most disadvantaged contexts may require additional support to realise their potential (Anthony et al., 2002; Ward, 2005). Furthermore, differences exist between Western and Māori conceptions of giftedness and talented and how to respond appropriately (see, for instance, Bevan-Brown, 2010b, 2012; Jenkins et al., 2010; Macfarlane, 2010; Mahaki & Mahaki, 2010; Niwa, 2010;

Webber, 2011). Similarly, a limited body of work is revealing Tongan and other Pasifika understandings of giftedness and talent and providing strategies to appropriate cater for these students (see Frengley-Vaipuna, 2007; Frengley-Vaipuna et al., 2011; Tait, Horsley, & Tait, 2016).

It seems evident that adequate pre-service and in-service training is a significant barrier to gifted and talented education not just in this school, but throughout New Zealand. PLD is required to assist teachers to acquire the skills required to qualitatively differentiate the curriculum, conceptualise giftedness and talent, and to challenge their own attitudes toward the gifted and talented.

PLD, however, is not particularly easy to come by (Riley & Sturgess, 2005; Scobie-Jennings, 2013; Tapper & Riley, 2015). The Ministry provides two options for gifted and talented PLD – Te Toi Tupu and a dedicated gifted and talented community on Te Kete Ipurangi (Te Kete Ipurangi, 2016). Whilst the school in this study gained access to Te Toi Tupu, the facilitators can work with only a limited number of schools per year. Other methods of gifted and talented PLD, such as postgraduate qualifications or PLD through private organisations, are available in New Zealand but at significant personal or school cost. Though the Ministry provides opportunities, it is not meeting the demand and the cost of the other providers is prohibitive for many schools and individual teachers. These factors create hindrances to educator training and thus the appropriate provisions for gifted and talented students (Riley & Bicknell, 2013; Riley & Sturgess, 2005; Tapper & Riley, 2015).

6.6.2 Resources

Lack of resources is a longstanding barrier to the provision of effective gifted and talented education in New Zealand. ERO (2008a) noted the issue of resourcing in their 1998 report. Riley's (2003b) study found that 32% of rural principals reported resources to be in critical need. In Riley et al.'s (2004) study, schools reported the lack of resources as a major barrier. Keen (2006) additionally found that schools were struggling to resource programmes for their gifted and talented students. Recently, Riley and Bicknell (2013) noted a lack of resourcing to be a barrier in New Zealand gifted and talented education.

Time, as a resource, was a major concern for the teachers in the focus group, particularly an increased workload in the form of extra administrative duties and additional contact time required. All of the teachers wondered how the timetable would, or could be altered to allow for flexible student groupings and teacher release to work within interest and expertise areas.

A lack of time and burgeoning workloads are often issues for teachers in providing effective gifted and talented education. Watters (2013) found that teachers who want to update planning and provisions for gifted learners struggle with the time needed to do so. Riley (2003a) also identified the lack of time as a barrier to effective provision. Furthermore, teachers often mention timetabling conflicts when attempting to offer acceleration or between-class groupings (Anthony et al., 2002; Wardman, 2009). Adding the extra workload of implementing appropriate gifted and talented education is a real concern for teachers and administrators (Cathcart, 2005; Gagne, 2007; Riley, 2003b; Watters, 2013).

Though lack of funding is typically a concern for schools (see, for instance, Apted et al., 2007; Riley, 2003a; Riley & Bicknell, 2013; Riley & Sturgess, 2005), it did not feature highly as a resource concern for the teachers. Rather, concerns regarding human resources and questions around staffing were more prominent, particularly in the focus group. Riley (2003a) observes that human resources can be difficult for schools to procure. A lack of human resources can hinder flexible groupings and the types of activities that can be provided in schools. She urges schools to communicate with their community to see if there are parents and whanau willing to volunteer.

Enthusiastic and supportive volunteers and teachers act as enablers to effective gifted and talented education in schools (Riley et al., 2004; Riley & Bicknell, 2013). However, people can also become barriers. Negative attitudes and misconceptions about giftedness and talent in the school community need to be addressed to ensure that the human resources help, rather than hinder gifted and talented education in a school (Bevan-Brown, 2012).

A significant tension point for the teachers in the focus group was the expectations of what can be achieved in an inclusive classroom. The pressure to help underachieving students attain National Standards and to now extend and enrich gifted and talented learners was expressed.

Time, workload, funding and other resourcing issues may be linked to the current government's introduction of National Standards. National Standards set out the standard each student should achieve by a certain level of schooling in mathematics, writing and reading. One of the main reasons for the introduction of National Standards was to further support the children in the low-performing "tail" (Ministry of Education, 2010a). The Ministry makes it clear that the areas of priority in National Standards are children in the tail including Māori and Pasifika children who are overrepresented in the tail.

Research in the United States regarding NCLB, which similarly emphasises struggling learners (Robinson, 2009), has found that improving lower-ability outcomes tends to come at the expense of gifted and talented learners (Bourne, 2009; Jolly & Makel, 2010; Loertscher, 2010; Robinson, 2009; Ward, 2005). During NCLB, where gains have been made for struggling learners, gifted and talented student achievement has generally been minimal. The priority is to increase the number of students meeting, not surpassing, minimum standards (Gagne, 2007). This prioritisation has led to teachers spending the majority of their time with lower-achieving students leaving gifted and talented students with little one-on-one attention (Bourne, 2009; Jolly & Makel, 2010). Additionally, lack of funding put schools in the position of deciding which programmes would be earmarked for resources. Jolly and Makel (2010) contend that in the climate of national performance standards for literacy and numeracy, schools chose programmes that helped boost achievement in those areas over any "extras" in which gifted and talented programmes are typically included.

Recently, New Zealand authors have also found tension between supporting the tail and the "beak" of learners. Though gifted and talented students are recognised as learners with special educational needs in NAG 1, the Ministry does not actively prioritise them as such (Riley, 2003a; Riley & Bicknell, 2013; Tapper & Riley, 2015). The onus is left to individual schools to ensure that gifted and talented students are catered for effectively. It is possible that without appropriate Ministerial acknowledgement and resourcing, the gifted and talented are left in a vulnerable position in schools that are required by the Ministry to prioritise only other learners with special education needs (Tapper & Riley, 2015).

6.7 Chapter Summary

It is apparent that leadership engagement is crucial for the growth and sustainability of gifted and talented education in a school. After senior management prioritised gifted and talented students, barriers to their education began to ease. It is additionally evident that PLD is required to increase teachers' skills and understandings as well as to challenge misconceptions regarding giftedness and talent. Resourcing concerns, particularly regarding time, were further evident and remain a barrier for provision at the school.

Chapter 7: Conclusion

This study investigated one primary school's provisions for gifted and talented students. I sought to understand how the school catered for these students. I investigated its policy, identification procedures, school-based provisions and self-review practices. I also sought to contextualise the school's provision by describing its recent history and gaining teacher, student and parent/whanau perspectives.

7.1 Limitations

The conclusions of this study should be read against the backdrop of limitations. Firstly, because this is a small-scale, single case study, the conclusions cannot be generalised. Rather, they should be read in conjunction with other localised and national studies to develop a picture of current gifted and talented education in New Zealand. Secondly, the response rate for the questionnaires was below the recommendation for validity. However, this data was used as a part of the triangulation process and no findings were based solely on questionnaire data. Thirdly, all of the teachers and students were female in this study which may have skewed the perspectives, particularly the student perspectives on the learning environment. This could not be avoided in this study as all of the school's teachers were female and I could only obtain data from students who returned a parental consent form.

7.2 Summary

My initial supposition before undertaking this research was that the school would be struggling to provide appropriate gifted and talented provision after the government's priority shifted away from this group of learners. This presumption has been partly confirmed. The school had limited provision in place and was still grappling with the concept of giftedness and talent. However, the school had recognised the need for change and had begun to actively develop a broader definition of giftedness and talent, multicultural and multi-categorical identification procedures, inclusive school-

wide provisions and formal self-review processes. Further, senior management have provided on-going PLD and showed a willingness to tackle barriers.

At the time of this study, the school was adjusting its priorities to include gifted and talented learners within the category of students with special education needs. This shift came as the school leadership began to seriously address the inclusion of gifted and talented learners in NAG 1, which is a mandate for schools to appropriately meet the needs of all students with special needs. More so, the shift in priorities came as senior management sought to effectively respond to the needs of these particular children in the school. Meeting their needs is at the heart of gifted and talented education.

Though schools continue to report that they do not have adequate funding, resources or support to provide and sustain the most effective gifted and talented education, there is still hope for gifted and talented education in New Zealand. In a time when Ministry leadership has waned and gifted and talented education is off the political agenda, some educators are taking it upon themselves to keep it on their school's agenda.

7.3 Recommendations

The first recommendation arising from this research is that the government should increase its Ministry of Education leadership for gifted and talented education. Gifted and talented children should not have to simply hope that their teachers will appropriately respond to their needs; all school leaders and Boards of Trustees should ensure that all teachers are supported to identify and provide for their gifted and talented students. National leadership is required to better ensure that all schools and educators are prioritising the needs of the gifted and talented. NAG 1 provides the prioritisation; the government must now *support* the prioritisation.

The gifted and talented need to be acknowledged and included in inclusive education, with adequate funding and resourcing made available to schools, if "success for all" rhetoric is to become reality. Meaningful support should include improved access to PLD so educators can better their understanding of the importance of providing appropriate gifted and talented education and obtain the skills and knowledge

to do so. Furthermore, increased funding and resourcing, similar to that available for other learners with special education needs, is necessary to support gifted and talented children and their teachers, particularly in inclusive, mainstream classes.

7.4 Further Research

This study took place just before changes to the school's provision were implemented. Further research could investigate the effects of these changes for the school's gifted and talented education. Another area for further research could be the influence of leadership engagement on gifted and talented education. The New Zealand-based literature in this area is limited. Lastly, research into effective inclusive practices that cater for learners from across the spectrum of ability would be beneficial.

7.5 Concluding Comments

This research indicates that one can be hopeful that gifted and talented education will remain on the educational agenda. The findings demonstrate that educators are becoming more aware of the characteristics and unique learning requirements of gifted and talented learners, and are resolving to cater for this group of students. The findings further reveal an opportunity for the Ministry to bolster its current mandate by explicitly prioritising gifted and talented students as learners with special education needs. Though the inclusion of the gifted and talented in NAG 1 has made the obligation clear, it is meeting the real needs of children that drives educators to improve provision for them. How much more advanced could their efforts be if the Ministry more adequately supported this group of learners?

Bibliography

Anthony, G., Rawlins, P., Riley, T., & Winsley, J. (2002). Accelerated learning in New Zealand secondary school mathematics. *The Australasian Journal of Gifted Education*, *11*(2), 11–17.

Apted, K., Macnee, K., Court, M., & Riley, T. (2007, November 1). The development of schoolwide programmes in gifted and talented education - What can we learn from other schools? *New Zealand Principal's Federation Magazine,* 37–46.

Ary, D., Cheser Jacobs, L., & Sorensen, C. (2010). *Introduction to research in education*. Belmont, CA: Wadsorth, Cengage Learning.

Auerbach, C. F., & Silverstein, L. B. (2003). *Qualitative data: An introduction to coding and analysis*. New York, NY: New York University Press.

Ballam, N. (2016). To sir, with love: Messages for educators from gifted financially disadvantaged young people. *The Australasian Journal of Gifted Education*, *25*(1), 5–17.

Bassey, M. (2003). Case study research. In J. Swann & J. Pratt (Eds.), *Educational research in practice: Making sense of methodology* (pp. 111–123). London, England: Continuum.

Bate, J., Clark, D., & Riley, T. (2012). Gifted Kids curriculum: What do the students say? *Kairanga*, *13*(2), 23–28.

Bevan-Brown, J. (2005). Providing a culturally responsive environment for gifted Māori learners. *International Education Journal*, *6*(2), 150–155.

Bevan-Brown, J. (2010a). Running the gauntlet: A gifted Māori learner's journey through secondary school. In A. Macfarlane (Ed.), *Above the clouds: Ka rewa ake ki nga kapua: A collection of readings for identifying and nurturing Māori*

students of promise (pp. 59–74). Christchurch, New Zealand: Te Waipounamu Focus Group.

Bevan-Brown, J. (2010b). The importance of culture. In A. Macfarlane (Ed.), *Above the clouds: Ka rewa ake ki nga kapua: A collection of readings for identifying and nurturing Māori students of promise* (pp. 19–28). Christchurch, New Zealand: Te Waipounamu Focus Group.

Bevan-Brown, J. (2011). Gifted and talented Māori learners. In R. Moltzen (Ed.), *Gifted and talented: New Zealand perspectives* (3rd ed., pp. 82–110). Auckland, New Zealand: Pearson.

Bevan-Brown, J. (2012). Digging deeper, flying higher. *APEX: The New Zealand Journal of Gifted Education, 17*(1). Retrieved from http://www.giftedchildren.org.nz/apex

Bicknell, B. (2006). Investigating parental roles of mathematically gifted students. In P. Grootenboer, R. Zevenbergen, & M. Chinnappan (Eds.), *Identities, cultures and learning spaces volume 1: Proceedings of the 29th annual conference of the Mathematics Education Research Group of Australasia* (pp. 76–83). Adelaide, Australia: MERGA Inc. Retrieved from https://www.merga.net.au/documents/RP52006.pdf

Blackett, J., & Hermansson, G. L. (2005). Guidance and counselling of the gifted and talented in New Zealand. *International Journal for the Advancement of Counselling*, *27*(2), 277–287. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10447-005-3186-2

Blackett, R., & Webb, J. T. (2011). The social-emotional dimension of giftedness: The SENG support model. *The Australasian Journal of Gifted Education*, *20*(1), 5–13.

Bourne, J. (2009, November). Gifted children left behind: Is New Zealand doing enough for our talented kids? *New Zealand Principal*, *24*(4), 22.

Bourne, J., & Sturgess, A. (2006). If any one can, Kiwis can: Every teacher, a teacher of gifted learners. *The Australasian Journal of Gifted Education*, *15*(1), 44–50.

Brough, C. (2007). Nurturing talent through curriculum integration. *Kairanga*, *8*(1), 8–12.

Burton, N., Brundrett, M., & Jones, M. (2014). *Doing your education research project* (2nd ed.). London, England: Sage.

Bush, K. (2011). *'The cluster team': A model of collaboration and collegiality in New Zealand gifted and talented education 2003-2008* (Masterate thesis, Massey University, Palmerston North, New Zealand). Retrieved from http://mro.massey.ac.nz/handle/10179/3039

Cathcart, R. (2005). *They're not bringing my brain out: Understanding and working with gifted and talented learners* (3rd ed.). Auckland, New Zealand: Hodder Education.

Cathcart, R. (2011). Thinking about Pakeha and Māori and gifted children. *The Australasian Journal of Gifted Education*, *20*(1), 61–63.

Cathcart, R., & Pou, N. (2010). The gifted child who is Māori. In A. Macfarlane (Ed.), *Above the clouds: Ka rewa ake ki nga kapua: A collection of readings for identifying and nurturing Māori students of promise* (pp. 137–144). Christchurch, New Zealand: Te Waipounamu Focus Group.

Clark, D. (2014, May). If you don't lead, how can they follow? *Education Review*. Retrieved from http://www.educationreview.co.nz/magazine/may-2014/if-you-dont-lead-how-can-they-follow/

Developing the next generation of innovators. (2014, February 10). *New Zealand Education Gazette (Online), 93*(2), 6–7.

Dixon, R. M., Craven, R. G., & Martin, A. J. (2006). Underachievement in a whole city cohort of academically gifted children: What does it look like? *The Australasian Journal of Gifted Education, 15*(2), 9–15.

Drever, E. (1995). *Using semi-structured interviews in small-scale research: A teacher's guide* (Vol. 15). Glasgow, Scotland: The Scottish Council for Research in Education.

Education Review Office. (2008a). *Schools' provision for gifted and talented students*. Retrieved from http://www.ero.govt.nz/National-Reports/Schools-Provision-for-Gifted-and-Talented-Students-June-2008

Education Review Office. (2008b). *Schools' provision for gifted and talented students: Good practice*. Retrieved from http://www.ero.govt.nz/National-Reports/Schools-Provision-for-Gifted-and-Talented-Students-Good-Practice-June-2008

Education Review Office. (2014). [redacted] School - 19/02/2014. Education Review Office. Retrieved from http://www.ero.govt.nz/review-reports/[redacted]-school-19-02-2014/

Erb, W. (2008, October 27). Grouped schools add to learning. *New Zealand Education Gazette (Online), 87*(19). Retrieved from http://www.edgazette.govt.nz/Articles/Article.aspx?ArticleId=7707

Fraser, D. (2011). To boldly go where no one has gone before: The enterprise of creativity. In R. Moltzen (Ed.), *Gifted and talented: New Zealand perspectives* (3rd ed., pp. 157–184). Auckland, New Zealand: Pearson.

Fraser, D. (2013). Keeping gifted education on the agenda: Interview with Professor Roger Moltzen. *APEX: The New Zealand Journal of Gifted Education, 18*(1). Retrieved from http://www.giftedchildren.org.nz/apex

Frengley-Vaipuna, I. (2007). *Creating kakala: Gifted and talented Tongan students in New Zealand secondary schools* (Masterate thesis, Massey University, Palmerston North, New Zealand). Retrieved from http://mro.massey.ac.nz/handle/10179/7092

Frengley-Vaipuna, I., Kupu-MacIntyre, L., & Riley, T. (2011). Successful Tongan students in New Zealand secondary schools: Default or design? *Kairaranga*, *12*(2), 42–50.

Gagne, F. (2007). Ten commandments for academic talent development. *Gifted Child Quarterly, 51*(2), 93–118. https://doi.org/10.1177/0016986206296660

Gallagher, G. (2011). Are you going to be the one to understand me? *New Zealand Journal of Counselling*, *31*(1), 70–86.

Garrett, L., & Moltzen, R. (2011). Writing because I want to, not because I have to: Young gifted writers' perspectives on the factors that 'matter' in developing expertise. *English Teaching: Practice and Critique*, *10*(1), 165–180.

Gerring, J. (2006). *Case study research: Principles and practices*. Retrieved from http://www.langtoninfo.com/web_content/9780521676564_frontmatter.pdf

Gifted and talented provisions in the Every Student Succeeds Act. (2016). *Gifted Child Today, 39*(2), 74. https://doi.org/10.1177/1076217516631078

Grant, A. (2013). Professional conversations about young gifted children. *Every Child*, *19*(1), 8–9.

Hornby, G., & Witte, C. (2014). Ability grouping in New Zealand high schools: Are practices evidence-based? *Preventing School Failure: Alternative Education for*

Children and Youth, *58*(2), 90–95. https://doi.org/10.1080/1045988X.2013.782531

Hornby, G., Witte, C., & Mitchell, D. (2011). Policies and practices of ability grouping in New Zealand intermediate schools. *Support for Learning*, *26*(3), 92–96.

Jenkins, H., Moltzen, R., & Macfarlane, A. (2010). Embracing Māori giftedness: The dynamics of power, culture and visibility. In A. Macfarlane (Ed.), *Above the clouds: Ka rewa ake ki nga kapua: A collection of readings for identifying and nurturing Māori students of promise* (pp. 75–92). Christchurch, New Zealand: Te Waipounamu Focus Group.

Johnston, P. M. G. (2003). Research in a bicultural context: The case of Aotearoa/New Zealand. In J. Swann & J. Pratt (Eds.), *Educational research in practice: Making sense of methodology* (pp. 98–110). London, England: Continuum.

Jolly, J. L., & Makel, M. C. (2010). No Child Left Behind: The inadvertent costs for high-achieving and gifted students. *Childhood Education*, *87*(1), 35–40. https://doi.org/10.1080/00094056.2010.10521436

Joy, K. (2006). Visual spatial giftedness: Identification and principles for differentiation. In T. Riley & J. Bevan-Brown (Eds.), *Proceedings of the Rising Tides: Nurturing Our Gifted Culture Part 2* (pp. 50–55). Wellington, New Zealand. Retrieved from http://www.confer.co.nz/gnt/finalpapers2.pdf

Keen, D. (2005). Talent in the New Millennium: A two-year research study of gifted education. *International Education Journal*, *6*(2), 206–217.

Keen, D. (2006). Talent in the new millennium and tracking talent. In T. Riley & J. Bevan-Brown (Eds.), *Proceedings of the Rising Tides: Nurturing Our Gifted Culture Part 2* (pp. 56–61). Wellington, New Zealand. Retrieved from http://www.confer.co.nz/gnt/finalpapers2.pdf

Kirby, A., & Townsend, M. (2005). Conversations with accelerated and non-accelerated gifted students. *APEX: The New Zealand Journal of Gifted Education*, *14*(1). Retrieved from http://www.giftedchildren.org.nz/apex

Lewis, J. D., Cruzeiro, P. A., & Hall, C. A. (2007). Impact of two elementary school principals' leadership on gifted education in their buildings. *Gifted Child Today*, *30*(2), 56–62.

Loertscher, D. (2010). Bridging the excellence gap. *Teacher Librarian*, *37*(4), 50–51.

Luscombe, A., & Riley, T. (2001). An examination of self-concept in academically gifted adolescents: Do gender differences occur? *Roeper Review*, *24*(1), 20–22. https://doi.org/10.1080/02783190109554120

Macfarlane, A. (2010). Strategies for teachers. In A. Macfarlane (Ed.), *Above the clouds: Ka rewa ake ki nga kapua: A collection of readings for identifying and nurturing Māori students of promise* (pp. 167–206). Christchurch, New Zealand: Te Waipounamu Focus Group.

Mahaki, P., & Mahaki, C. (2010). Mana tu, mana ora - Identifying characteristics of Māori giftedness. In A. Macfarlane (Ed.), *Above the clouds: Ka rewa ake ki nga kapua: A collection of readings for identifying and nurturing Māori students of promise* (pp. 147–154). Christchurch, New Zealand: Te Waipounamu Focus Group.

Maker, C. J., & Shiever, S. W. (Eds.). (2005). *Teaching models in education of the gifted* (3rd ed.). Austin, TX: Pro-Ed.

Margrain, V. (2010). Narratives of young gifted children. *Kairanga*, *11*(2), 33–38.

Margrain, V., Lee, S., & Farquhar, S. E. (2013). Education of gifted young children: Contingency of views on first-hand experience and conception of giftedness.

APEX: The New Zealand Journal of Gifted Education, *18*(1). Retrieved from http://www.giftedchildren.org.nz/apex

Martin, J. (2006). Academic acceleration through the eyes of young kiwis. In *Proceedings of the Rising Tides: Nurturing Our Gifted Culture Part 2* (pp. 71–74). Wellington, New Zealand. Retrieved from http://www.confer.co.nz/gnt/finalpapers2.pdf

Ministry of Education. (2008). *Nurturing gifted and talented children: A parent-teacher partnership*. Wellington, New Zealand: Learning Media.

Ministry of Education. (2010a). From great to excellent / National Standards / Kia ora - NZ Curriculum Online. Retrieved 17 November 2015, from http://nzcurriculum.tki.org.nz/National-Standards/From-great-to-excellent

Ministry of Education. (2010b). Success for all: Every school, every child. Ministry of Education. Retrieved from http://www.education.govt.nz/

Ministry of Education. (2012). *Gifted and talented students: Meeting their needs in New Zealand schools*. Wellington, New Zealand: Learning Media.

Ministry of Education. (2014). Success for all: Special education: Briefing to incoming minister. Ministry of Education. Retrieved from http://www.education.govt.nz/

Moltzen, R. (2004). Gifted education in New Zealand. *Gifted Education International*, *18*(2), 139–152. https://doi.org/10.1177/026142940301800204

Moltzen, R. (2006). Can 'inclusion' work for the gifted and talented? In C. M. M. Smith (Ed.), *Including the gifted and talented: Making inclusion work for more gifted and able learners* (pp. 41–55). London, England: Routledge.

Moltzen, R. (2011a). Characteristics of gifted children. In R. Moltzen (Ed.), *Gifted and talented: New Zealand perspectives* (3rd ed., pp. 54–81). Auckland, New Zealand: Pearson.

Moltzen, R. (2011b). Conceptualising of giftedness and talent. In R. Moltzen (Ed.), *Gifted and talented: New Zealand perspectives* (3rd ed., pp. 31–53). Auckland, New Zealand: Pearson.

Moltzen, R. (2011c). Historical perspectives. In R. Moltzen (Ed.), *Gifted and talented: New Zealand perspectives* (3rd ed., pp. 1–30). Auckland, New Zealand: Pearson.

Munro, J. (2013). *High-ability learning and brain processes: How neuroscience can help us to understand how gifted and talented students learn and the implications for teaching*. Paper presented at the ACER Institute Research Conference 2013, Melbourne, Australia. Retrieved from http://research.acer.edu.au/research_conference/RC2013/5august/18/

Needham, V. (2012). Primary teachers' perceptions of the social and emotional aspects of gifted and talented education. *APEX: The New Zealand Journal of Gifted Education*, *17*(1). Retrieved from http://www.giftedchildren.org.nz/apex

Niederer, K., Irwin, R. J., Irwin, K. C., & Reilly, I. L. (2003). Identification of mathematically gifted children in New Zealand. *High Ability Studies*, *17*(1), 71–84. https://doi.org/10.1080/13032000093535

Niwa, T. (2010). Māori students with special abilities. In *Above the clouds: Ka rewa ake ki nga kapua: Identifying and nurturing Māori students of promise* (pp. 119–126). Christchurch, New Zealand: Te Waipounamu Focus Group.

Page, A. (2006). Three models for understanding gifted education. *Kairanga*, *7*(2), 11–15.

Patton, M. Q. (2015). *Qualitative research and evaluation methods* (4th ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.

Pratt, J., & Swann, J. (2003). Doing good research. In J. Swann & J. Pratt (Eds.), *Educational research in practice: Making sense of methodology* (pp. 175–193). London, England: Continuum.

Rambo, K. E., & McCoach, D. B. (2012). Teacher attitudes toward subject-specific acceleration: Instrument development and validation. *Journal for the Education of the Gifted*, *35*(2), 129–152. https://doi.org/10.1177/0162353212440591

Rawlins, P. (2004). Students' perceptions of their experiences from within acceleration programs in mathematics. *Australian Senior Mathematics Journal*, *18*(1), 42–51.

Renzulli, J. S. (2002). Emerging conceptions of giftedness: Building a bridge to the new century. *Exceptionality: A Special Education Journal*, *10*(2), 67–75. https://doi.org/10.1207/S15327035EX1002_2

Revel Sheely, A., & Kreger Silverman, L. (2007). Defining the few. In K. Kay, D. Robson, & J. Fort Brenneman (Eds.), *High-IQ kids: Collected insights, information, and personal stories from the experts* (pp. 6–14). Minneapolis, MN: Free Spirit Pub.

Riley, T. (2002). Looking back and thinking ahead. *Gifted Child Today*, *25*(2), 46–49.

Riley, T. (2003a). Practicing what we preach: The reality factors in talent development. *Gifted Child Today*, *26*(1), 45–49.

Riley, T. (2003b, March). To be young, gifted and educated in rural New Zealand: Charting future directions. *New Zealand Principal*. Retrieved from http://nzpfacnz2.digiwebhosting.com/sites/default/files/March03_GiftedEducation.pdf

Riley, T. (2005). Looking ahead: Research to inform practice in the education of gifted and talented students in New Zealand. *APEX: The New Zealand Journal of Gifted Education*, *14*(1). Retrieved from http://www.giftedchildren.org.nz/apex

Riley, T. (2012). Including gifted and talented students: Shifting our mindsets from exclusive to inclusive. In Centre of Excellence for Research in Inclusive Education (Ed.), *Inclusive education: Perspectives on professional practice* (pp. 189–203). Auckland, NZ: Dunmore Pub.

Riley, T., Bevan-Brown, J., Bicknell, B., Carroll-Lind, J., & Kearney, A. (2004). *The extent, nature and effectiveness of planned approaches in New Zealand schools for providing for gifted and talented students*. New Zealand: Ministry of Education.

Riley, T., & Bicknell, B. (2013). Gifted and talented education in New Zealand schools: A decade later. *APEX: The New Zealand Journal of Gifted Education*, *18*(1). Retrieved from http://www.giftedchildren.org.nz/apex

Riley, T., & Moltzen, R. (2010). *Enhancing and igniting talent development initiatives: Research to determine effectiveness* (No. RMR-938). Wellington, New Zealand: Ministry of Education.

Riley, T., & Moltzen, R. (2011). Learning by doing: Action research to evaluate provisions for gifted and talented students. *Kairaranga*, *12*(1), 23–31.

Riley, T., & Sturgess, A. (2005). Professional development to support gifted and talented education in New Zealand. *The Australasian Journal of Gifted Education*, *14*(1), 36–49.

Robinson, A. (2009). Myth 10: Examining the Ostrich: Gifted services do not cure a sick regular program. *Gifted Child Quarterly*, *53*(4), 259–261. https://doi.org/10.1177/0016986209346935

Russell, V., & Riley, T. (2011). Personalising learning in secondary schools: Gifted education leading the way. *APEX: The New Zealand Journal of Gifted Education*, *16*(1). Retrieved from http://www.giftedchildren.org.nz/apex

Rymarczyk Hyde, C. (2010). Māori children with special abilities (MCWSA): Recognising and providing for: 'Nga pohutukawa roa - tall pohutukawas'. In A. Macfarlane (Ed.), *Above the clouds: Ka rewa ake ki nga kapua: A collection of readings for identifying and nurturing Māori students of promise* (pp. 93–100). Christchurch, New Zealand: Te Waipounamu Focus Group.

Scobie-Jennings, E. (2013). An investigation into the identification of Māori gifted and talented students in mainstream schools. *APEX: The New Zealand Journal of Gifted Education, 18*(1). Retrieved from http://www.giftedchildren.org.nz/apex

Scott, D., & Usher, R. (1999). *Researching education: Data, methods and theory in educational enquiry*. London, England: Continuum.

Swann, J., & Pratt, J. (2003). Why you should read this book. In J. Swann & J. Pratt (Eds.), *Educational research in practice: Making sense of methodology* (pp. 3–8). London, England: Continuum.

Tait, K., Horsley, J., & Tait, C. (2016). How do academically successful Paskifa students perceive task value? *Australasian Journal of Gifted Education, 25*(1), 47–57.

Tapper, L. (2012). Conceptions of giftedness in a global, modern world: Where are we at in Aotearoa New Zealand 2012? *APEX: The New Zealand Journal of Gifted Education, 17*(1). Retrieved from http://www.giftedchildren.org.nz/apex

Tapper, L., & Riley, T. (2015, December). Turning rhetoric into reality. *Education Review: Sector Voices*, 34–35.

Te Kete Ipurangi. (2016). Gifted and talented online: Realising potential. Ministry of Education. Retrieved from http://gifted.tki.org.nz/

Te Toi Tupu. (2016). Te Toi Tupu Impact. Te Toi Tupu Leading Learning Network. Retrieved from http://tetoitupu.org/te-toi-tupu-impact

Townsend, M. (2011). The need to balance acceleration with enrichment in gifted education. In R. Moltzen (Ed.), *Gifted and talented: New Zealand perspectives* (3rd ed., pp. 252–275). Auckland, New Zealand: Pearson.

Townsend, M., & Kuttner, E. (2005). Gifted children's views of leadership in schools. *The Australasian Journal of Gifted Education*, *14*(2), 34–38.

Tunmer, W. E., Prochnow, J. E., & Chapman, J. W. (2003). Science in educational research. In *Educational research in practice: Making sense of methodology* (pp. 84–97). London, England: Continuum.

Ward, C. V. (2005). Giftedness, disadvantage, and law. *Journal of Education Finance*, *31*(1), 45–64.

Wardman, J. (2009). Secondary teachers', student teachers' and education students' attitudes to full-year academic acceleration as a strategy for gifted students. *Australasian Journal of Gifted Education*, *18*(1), 25–36.

Wardman, J., & Hattie, J. (2012). Administrators' perceptions of full-year acceleration at high school. *The Australasian Journal of Gifted Education*, *21*(1), 32–41.

Warmke, A. (2015). *Identification and provisions for gifted and talented students at a boys' secondary school in New Zealand* (Masterate thesis, Massey University, Palmerston North, New Zealand). Retrieved from http://mro.massey.ac.nz/handle/10179/7542

Watters, J. J. (2013). Starting small: A staged approach to professional development in gifted education. *The Australasian Journal of Gifted Education*, *22*(1), 18–29.

Webber, M. (2011). Gifted and proud: On being exceptional and Māori. In P. Whitinui (Ed.), *Kia tangi te tītī : permission to speak : successful schooling for Māori students in the 21st century : issues, challenges and alternatives* (pp. 227–241). Wellington, New Zealand: NZCER Press.

Wellisch, M., Brown, J., Taylor, A., Knight, R., Berresford, L., Campbell, L., & Cohen, A. (2011). Secure attachment and high IQ: Are gifted children better adjusted? *The Australasian Journal of Gifted Education*, *20*(2), 23–33.

Yin, R. K. (2009). *Case study research: Design and methods* (4th ed., Vol. 5). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Inc.

Appendices

Appendix A

MASSEY UNIVERSITY
INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
TE KURA O TE MATAURANGA

16 September 2015

Dear Principal,

My name is Jami Kimbrough Wallace. I am a postgraduate student working towards a Master's degree in education at Massey University under the supervision of Dr. Tracy Riley and Dr. Judith Donaldson. As a part of my degree, I am conducting research into gifted and talented education.

The purpose of this research is to increase understanding and knowledge of gifted and talented education in New Zealand schools. It has been over a decade since the Ministry of Education specifically required schools to provide for the needs of gifted and talented learners. This research will provide current, in-depth information about gifted and talented education in a primary school setting.

The intention of the case study is to tell the story of gifted and talented education at [redacted] and highlight the recent innovations being implemented at the school. This case study is not designed to evaluate the school, but to describe its identification and provision policy and procedures. Upon its completion, a copy of the case study will be available to the school.

Once you have confirmed that the research can take place, I would like to visit the school early in Term 4. The research will include:

- semi-structured, in-depth interviews with the special education needs coordinator and the gifted and talented coordinator;
- a focus group with six teachers that represent a cross-section of the teaching staff;
- student and parent surveys; and,
- access to photocopies of any strategic plans, written policies, a gifted database and individual education plans for the purpose of document analysis.

Informed consent will be obtained from all staff, students and parents that are taking part in the research. The interviews and focus group interview will be tape-recorded and transcribed for analysis. The transcription will be made available to ensure accuracy. All data will be stored securely with me until the completion of the study. It will then be stored in a secure location at Massey University for five years. The findings of this case study will be reported in a way that will keep the names of staff, students and parents, as well as the name of the school and its location anonymous. All information gathered will remain confidential.

The staff, students and parents are under no obligation to participate in this research. If they do decide to participate, they have the right to:

- decline to answer any particular question;
- withdraw from the study;
- ask any questions about the study at any time during participation;

Te Kunenga ki Pūrehuroa
Institute of Education
Cnr Albany Drive & Collinson Road, Private Bag 11222, Palmerston North 4442, New Zealand T 06 356 9099 www.massey.ac.nz

- provide information on the understanding that their name, and that of the school, will not be used;
- ask for the audiotape to be turned off at any time during the interviews.

This project has been evaluated by peer review and judged to be low risk. Consequently, it has not been reviewed by one of the University's Human Ethics Committees. The researchers named above are responsible for the ethical conduct of this research.

If you have any concerns about the conduct of this research that you wish to raise with someone other than the researcher, please contact Dr Brian Finch, Director, Research Ethics, [redacted].

If your school is willing to take part in this case study, please email me stating that you are willing for the research to take place in [redacted] Please email by 24 September 2015.

Please feel free to contact me on [redacted] if you have any questions or concerns. You can also contact my supervisor on [redacted].

Thank you for your time.

Sincerely,

Jami Kimbrough Wallace

Appendix B

MASSEY UNIVERSITY
INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
TE KURA O TE MĀTAURANGA

Gifted and Talented Education in Aotearoa New Zealand: A Primary School Perspective

IN-DEPTH INTERVIEW INFORMATION SHEET

My name is Jami Kimbrough Wallace. I am a postgraduate student working towards a Master's degree in education at Massey University under the supervision of Dr. Tracy Riley and Dr. Judith Donaldson. As a part of my degree, I am conducting research into gifted and talented education.

The purpose of this research is to increase the understanding and knowledge of gifted and talented education in New Zealand schools. It has been a decade since the Ministry of Education specifically required schools to provide for the needs of gifted and talented learners. This research will provide current, in-depth information about gifted and talented education in a primary school setting.

As the gifted and talented coordinator at [redacted], I would like to conduct a semi-formal in-depth interview with you. The interview will take 60 to 75 minutes and will be conducted at the school at a convenient time for you.

The purpose of the interview is to gather information regarding the history of gifted and talented education in the school, policy development and implementation and the procedures used to identify gifted learners and the provisions made for gifted learners. During the visit, I would also like to have access to photocopies of any strategic plans, written policies, a gifted database and individual education plans for the purpose of document analysis. This information is not intended to evaluate you or the school, but rather to tell the story of gifted and talented education at [redacted] and highlight the recent innovations being implemented at the school.

The interview will be tape-recorded and transcribed for analysis. The transcription will be made available to you to ensure accuracy. The data will be stored securely with me until the completion of the study. It will then be stored in a secure location at Massey University for five years. The findings of this case study will be reported in a way that will keep your name and the name and location of the school confidential and anonymous.

You are under no obligation to participate in this research. If you decide to participate, you have the right to:

- decline to answer any particular question;
- withdraw from the study;
- ask any questions about the study at any time during participation;
- provide information on the understanding that your name, and that of your school, will not be used;
- Ask for the audiotape to be turned off at any time during the interviews.

This project has been evaluated by peer review and judged to be low risk. Consequently, it has not been reviewed by one of the University's Human Ethics Committees. The researcher(s) named above are responsible for the ethical conduct of this research.

If you have any concerns about the conduct of this research that you wish to raise with someone other than the researcher, please contact Dr Brian Finch, Director, Research Ethics, telephone [redacted]

Te Kunenga ki Pūrehuroa
Institute of Education
Cnr Albany Drive & Collinson Road, Private Bag 11222, Palmerston North 4442, New Zealand T +64 6 356 9099 www.massey.ac.nz

If you have any questions or concerns about your participation in this research, please feel free to contact me on [redacted]. Alternatively, you can contact my supervisor, Dr. Tracy Riley, on [redacted].

Appendix C

MASSEY UNIVERSITY
INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
TE KURA O TE MĀTAURANGA

Gifted and Talented Education in Aotearoa New Zealand: A Primary School Perspective

IN-DEPTH INTERVIEW INFORMATION SHEET

My name is Jami Kimbrough Wallace. I am a postgraduate student working towards a Master's degree in education at Massey University under the supervision of Dr. Tracy Riley and Dr. Judith Donaldson. As a part of my degree, I am conducting research into gifted and talented education.

The purpose of this research is to increase the understanding and knowledge of gifted and talented education in New Zealand schools. It has been a decade since the Ministry of Education specifically required schools to provide for the needs of gifted and talented learners. This research will provide current, in-depth information about gifted and talented education in a primary school setting.

As the special education needs coordinator at [redacted], I would like to conduct a semi-formal in-depth interview with you. The interview will take 60 to 75 minutes and will be conducted at the school at a convenient time for you.

The purpose of the interview is to gather information regarding the history of gifted and talented education in the school, policy development and implementation and the procedures used to identify gifted learners and the provisions made for gifted learners. During the visit, I would also like to have access to photocopies of any strategic plans, written policies, a gifted database and individual education plans for the purpose of document analysis. This information is not intended to evaluate you or the school, but rather to tell the story of gifted and talented education at [redacted] and highlight the recent innovations being implemented at the school.

The interview will be tape-recorded and transcribed for analysis. The transcription will be made available to you to ensure accuracy. The data will be stored securely with me until the completion of the study. It will then be stored in a secure location at Massey University for five years. The findings of this case study will be reported in a way that will keep your name and the name and location of the school confidential and anonymous.

You are under no obligation to participate in this research. If you decide to participate, you have the right to:

- decline to answer any particular question;
- withdraw from the study;
- ask any questions about the study at any time during participation;
- provide information on the understanding that your name, and that of your school, will not be used;
- Ask for the audiotape to be turned off at any time during the interviews.

This project has been evaluated by peer review and judged to be low risk. Consequently, it has not been reviewed by one of the University's Human Ethics Committees. The researcher(s) named above are responsible for the ethical conduct of this research.

If you have any concerns about the conduct of this research that you wish to raise with someone other than the researcher, please contact Dr Brian Finch, Director, Research Ethics, telephone [redacted]

If you have any questions or concerns about your participation in this research, please feel free to contact me on [redacted]. Alternatively, you can contact my supervisor, Dr. Tracy Riley, on [redacted].

Appendix D

MASSEY UNIVERSITY
INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
TE KURA O TE MĀTAURANGA

Gifted and Talented Education in Aotearoa New Zealand: A Primary School Perspective

FOCUS GROUP INTERVIEW INFORMATION SHEET

My name is Jami Kimbrough Wallace. I am a postgraduate student working towards a Master's degree in education at Massey University under the supervision of Dr. Tracy Riley and Dr. Judith Donaldson. As a part of my degree, I am conducting research into gifted and talented education.

The purpose of this research is to increase the understanding and knowledge of gifted and talented education in New Zealand schools. It has been a decade since the Ministry of Education specifically required schools to provide for the needs of gifted and talented learners. This research will provide current, in-depth information about gifted and talented education in a primary school setting.

As a member of the teaching staff at [redacted] I invite you to participate in a focus group interview. The interview will take approximately one hour and will be conducted at the school. The purpose of the focus interview is to gather information regarding policy development and implementation, the procedures used to identify gifted learners and the provisions made for gifted learners in the classroom. The information gathered is not intended to evaluate you or the school, but rather to tell the story of gifted and talented education at [redacted] and highlight the recent innovations being implemented at the school.

The focus group interview will be tape-recorded and transcribed for analysis. The transcription will be made available to the school to ensure accuracy. The data will be stored securely with me until the completion of the study. It will then be stored in a secure location at Massey University for five years. The findings of this case study will be reported in a way that will keep your name and the name and location of the school confidential and anonymous.

You are under no obligation to participate in this research. If you decide to participate, you have the right to:

- decline to answer any particular question;
- withdraw from the study;
- ask any questions about the study at any time during participation;
- provide information on the understanding that your name, and that of your school, will not be used;
- Ask for the audiotape to be turned off at any time during the interviews.

This project has been evaluated by peer review and judged to be low risk. Consequently, it has not been reviewed by one of the University's Human Ethics Committees. The researcher(s) named above are responsible for the ethical conduct of this research.

If you have any concerns about the conduct of this research that you wish to raise with someone other than the researcher, please contact Dr Brian Finch, Director, Research Ethics, telephone [redacted].

If you have any questions or concerns about your participation in this research, please feel free to contact me on [redacted]. Alternatively, you can contact my supervisor, Dr. Tracy Riley, on [redacted]

Appendix E

MASSEY UNIVERSITY
INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
TE KURA O TE MATAURANGA

Gifted and Talented Education in Aotearoa New Zealand: A Primary School Perspective

IN-DEPTH INTERVIEW QUESTIONS

The interview will begin with an overview of the research that includes the purpose of the research and the interview procedure. I will outline participants' rights and gain informed consent before commencing with the interview. The following questions will be asked and additional comments will be accepted.

1. Why is gifted and talented education a priority for you and the [redacted]?
2. Describe the school's journey to this point, in terms of gifted and talented education.
3. What is your school's definition or concept of giftedness? What behaviours and characteristics do you associate with this definition of giftedness and talent?
4. How were the children in your class selected?
5. What methods are used to identify other gifted and talented students (who are not in the specialist class?)?
6. How do you differentiate the curriculum for students in this class? Do you provide opportunities for enrichment and acceleration? Please explain.
7. What type of professional development and learning has been offered/undertaken by you and the staff?
8. How do you connect with parents, whanau and the wider community to meet the needs of gifted learners?
9. How do parents and whanau contribute to the policy, identification and learning experiences?
10. How do you measure the effectiveness of your identification procedures and provisions in meeting the needs of gifted learners?
11. What is going well for your class and in the wider school for gifted and talented students? What enables this to happen?
12. What barriers do you and the school face in providing gifted and talented education?
13. What are the next steps for you and the school in terms of gifted and talented education?

Appendix F

MASSEY UNIVERSITY
INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
TE KURA O TE MĀTAURANGA

Gifted and Talented Education In Aotearoa New Zealand: A Primary School Perspective

IN-DEPTH INTERVIEW QUESTIONS

The interview will begin with an overview of the research that includes the purpose of the research and the interview procedure. I will outline participants' rights and gain informed consent before commencing with the interview. The following questions will be asked and additional comments will be accepted.

1. Why is gifted and talented education a priority for you and [redacted]?
2. Are gifted and talented students included in policies and provisions for students with special educational needs? Why and, if so, how?
3. Describe the school's journey to this point, in terms of gifted and talented education.
4. Which behaviours and characteristics do you associate with giftedness and talent?
5. How were the children in the enrichment class selected?
6. What methods are used to identify other gifted and talented students?
7. What type of professional development and learning has been offered/undertaken by you and the staff?
8. How do parents and whanau contribute to the policy, identification and learning experiences?
9. How do you measure the effectiveness of your identification procedures and provisions in meeting the needs of gifted learners?
10. What is going well in the school?
11. What barriers does the school face in providing gifted and talented education?
12. What are the next steps for the school in terms of gifted and talented education?

Te Kunenga ki Pūrehuroa
Institute of Education
Cnr Albany Drive & Collinson Road, Private Bag 11222, Palmerston North 4442, New Zealand T 06 356 9099 www.massey.ac.nz

Appendix G

MASSEY UNIVERSITY
INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
TE KURA O TE MĀTAURANGA

Gifted and Talented Education in Aotearoa New Zealand: A Primary School Perspective

FOCUS GROUP INTERVIEW QUESTIONS

The interview will begin with an overview of the research that includes the purpose of the research and the focus group interview procedure. I will outline participants' rights and gain informed consent before commencing with the interview. The following questions will be asked and additional comments will be accepted.

Questions

1. What is your school's definition of giftedness? What behaviours and characteristics do you associate with giftedness and talent?
2. How are gifted learned identified in your school?
3. How do you differentiate the curriculum for gifted learners in the school?
4. What type of professional development and learning have you undertaken that has influenced and/or informed your practice when working with gifted students?
5. What is going well in the school for gifted and talented students? What enables this to happen?
6. What barriers do you and the school face in providing gifted and talented education?
7. What are the next steps for you and the school in terms of gifted and talented education?

Appendix H

MASSEY UNIVERSITY
INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
TE KURA O TE MATAURANGA

Gifted and Talented Education in Aotearoa New Zealand: A Primary School Perspective

STUDENT SURVEY INFORMATION SHEET

My name is Jami Kimbrough Wallace. I am a postgraduate student working towards a Master's degree in education at Massey University under the supervision of Dr. Tracy Riley and Dr. Judith Donaldson. As a part of my degree, I am conducting research into gifted and talented education.

The purpose of this research is to increase the understanding and knowledge of gifted and talented education in New Zealand schools. This research will provide current, in-depth information about gifted and talented education in a primary school setting.

As a student in this class, I invite you to complete a survey. The survey will take approximately 15 minutes to complete. The information you provide will help tell the story of gifted and talented education at [redacted].

The surveys will be stored safely with me until the completion of the study. They will then be stored in a secure location at Massey University for five years. The case study will be written in a way that makes sure your name, the school's name and the school's location will be confidential.

You do not have to take part in this research. If you decide to participate, you have the right to:

- not answer any question;
- withdraw from the study;
- ask any questions about the study at any time during participation;
- provide information on the understanding that your name, and that of the school, will not be used.

The Parental Consent Form for Children Under Sixteen (16) Years Old must be returned to the school for you to participate in the project. You give permission to participate by completing the survey.

This project has been evaluated by peer review and judged to be low risk. Consequently, it has not been reviewed by one of the University's Human Ethics Committees. The researcher(s) named above are responsible for the ethical conduct of this research.

If you have any concerns about the conduct of this research that you wish to raise with someone other than the researcher, please contact Dr Brian Finch, Director, Research Ethics, telephone [redacted]

If you have any questions or concerns about taking part in this research, please feel free to contact me on [redacted]. Alternatively, you can contact my supervisor, Dr. Tracy Riley, on [redacted].

1

Appendix I

MASSEY UNIVERSITY
INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
TE KURA O TE MĀTAURANGA

Gifted and Talented Education in Aotearoa New Zealand: A Primary School Perspective

PARENT SURVEY INFORMATION SHEET

My name is Jami Kimbrough Wallace. I am a postgraduate student working towards a Master's degree in education at Massey University under the supervision of Dr. Tracy Riley and Dr. Judith Donaldson. As a part of my degree, I am conducting research into gifted and talented education.

The purpose of this research is to increase the understanding and knowledge of gifted and talented education in New Zealand schools. It has been a decade since the Ministry of Education specifically required schools to provide for the needs of gifted and talented learners. This research will provide current, in-depth information about gifted and talented education in a primary school setting.

As a parent of a student in the enrichment class, I invite you to complete a survey. The survey will take approximately 15 minutes to complete. The purpose of the survey is to gather information regarding what parents think about gifted and talented education and parental involvement with the school. The information gathered is intended to help tell the story of gifted and talented education at [redacted].

I also invite your child/ren to participate in the research. The children will complete a survey in the classroom. Their survey will take approximately 10 minutes to complete.

The surveys will be stored securely with me until the completion of the study. They will then be stored in a secure location at Massey University for five years. The findings of this case study will be reported in a way that will keep your name and the name of the school confidential and anonymous.

You and your child/ren are under no obligation to participate in this research. If you decide to participate and give permission for your child/ren to participate, you and your child/ren have the right to:

- decline to answer any particular question;
- withdraw from the study;
- ask any questions about the study at any time during participation;
- provide information on the understanding that your name, and that of the school, will not be used.

Completion and return of the parent survey implies consent. The enclosed Parental Consent Form for Children Under Sixteen (16) Years Old must be returned to the school for your child/ren to participate in the project.

This project has been evaluated by peer review and judged to be low risk. Consequently, it has not been reviewed by one of the University's Human Ethics Committees. The researcher(s) named above are responsible for the ethical conduct of this research.

If you have any concerns about the conduct of this research that you wish to raise with someone other than the researcher, please contact Dr Brian Finch, Director, Research Ethics, telephone [redacted].

Te Kunenga ki Pūrehuroa
Institute of Education
Cnr Albany Drive & Collinson Road, Private Bag 11222, Palmerston North 4442, New Zealand T 06 356 9099 www.massey.ac.nz

If you have any questions or concerns about your participation in this research, please feel free to contact me on [redacted]. Alternatively, you can contact my supervisor, Dr. Tracy Riley, on [redacted].

Appendix J

MASSEY UNIVERSITY
INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
TE KURA O TE MĀTAURANGA

Gifted and Talented Education in Aotearoa New Zealand: A Primary School Perspective

STUDENT SURVEY QUESTIONS

This survey will be held for a period of five (5) years.

Completing this survey means that you have read the information sheet. It also shows that you agree to participate in the research according to the conditions explained in the information sheet.

What is your ethnicity?

- ☐ Asian (specify) _____
- ☐ Maori (Iwi) _____
- ☐ NZ European
- ☐ Pacific Island (specify)_____
- ☐ Other (specify)_____

What is your gender?

- ☐ Boy
- ☐ Girl

1. Do you enjoy school?
   - ☐ Always
   - ☐ Usually
   - ☐ Sometimes
   - ☐ Seldom
   - ☐ Never

Te Kunenga ki Pūrehuroa
Institute of Education
Cnr Albany Drive & Colinson Road, Private Bag 11222, Palmerston North 4442, New Zealand T +64 6 356 9099 www.massey.ac.nz

2. Give an overall rating of your school work.
   - ☐ Too easy
   - ☐ Sometimes easy
   - ☐ Just right
   - ☐ Sometimes difficult
   - ☐ Too difficult

3. What type of activities help you learn best?

4. Does the classroom environment encourage your learning?
   - ☐ Always
   - ☐ Usually
   - ☐ Sometimes
   - ☐ Seldom
   - ☐ Never

5. Do you get a say in classroom rules, rewards and consequences?
   - ☐ Always
   - ☐ Usually
   - ☐ Sometimes
   - ☐ Seldom
   - ☐ Never

6. Are you encouraged to ask questions and participate in classroom discussions and activities?
   - ☐ Always
   - ☐ Usually
   - ☐ Sometimes
   - ☐ Seldom
   - ☐ Never

7. Rate the following learning activities in terms of what you do the most from 1 to 3. Only include during learning activities (not play or free time).

   1 = the most; 2 = the second most; 3 = the least

   - Say Something _____
   - Do Something _____
   - Write Something _____

8. What types of assignments do you complete?
   - Speechs
   - Models
   - Movies
   - PowerPoint or similar
   - Websites
   - Written
   - Other (specify) _____

9. How often do you get to choose the type of project you can complete?
   - ☐ Always
   - ☐ Usually
   - ☐ Sometimes
   - ☐ Seldom
   - ☐ Never

10. Do you get opportunities to discuss your work?
   - ☐ Always
   - ☐ Usually
   - ☐ Sometimes
   - ☐ Seldom
   - ☐ Never

11. How does your teacher know what you already know or have experience in? Please tick any that apply to you.

- ☐ Pretests
- ☐ Discussions
- ☐ Knows from last year
- ☐ Other (specify) _____

12. Does your teacher know about your background, culture and interests? Yes/No
13. Does your teacher treat you with respect?

- ☐ Always
- ☐ UsuallyS
- ☐ Sometimes
- ☐ Seldom
- ☐ Never

14. How important is your background, culture and interests in this classroom?

- ☐ Very important
- ☐ Important
- ☐ Not important

Do you have any other comments about your learning in this classroom or your teacher?

Appendix K

MASSEY UNIVERSITY
INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
TE KURA O TE MĀTAURANGA

Gifted and Talented Education in Aotearoa New Zealand: A Primary School Perspective

PARENT SURVEY QUESTIONS AND CONSENT FORM

This survey will be held for a period of five (5) years.

Completion and return of this survey indicates that you have read the information sheet and agree to participate in the research according to the conditions explained in the information sheet.

1. What is going well for your child's education in terms of developing their gifts and talents?

   What has enabled your child's development?

2. What could be improved in your child's education in terms of developing their gifts and talents?

3. Who first identified your child as gifted?

4. Does your child have an Individual Education Plan in place? Yes/No

   If yes, what input did you have in setting your child's goals?

How are you informed about your child's progress towards the goals?

5. What behaviours and characteristics do you associate with giftedness and talent?

6. What type of involvement/contact do you currently have, or would be willing to have, with [redacted] regarding your child's education? (Tick any boxes that apply.)

Current involvement	Activity	Potential involvement
	Assisting in the classroom	
	Discussions or surveys regarding how the school defines giftedness and talent	
	Leading or assisting in extracurricular activities	
	Leading or assisting in small-group projects in-class or outside of class	
	Meetings to discuss needs, special skills, and/or goals for your child	
	Mentoring students one-on-one	
	Newsletters	
	Parent-Teacher interviews	
	The school's website	
	Other (please specify)	
	Other (please specify)	

7. Do you have any other comments you would like to share about the gifted and talented education at [redacted]?

Appendix L

MASSEY UNIVERSITY
INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
TE KURA O TE MĀTAURANGA

Gifted and Talented Education in Aotearoa New Zealand: A Primary School Perspective

PARENTAL CONSENT FORM FOR CHILDREN UNDER SIXTEEN (16) YEARS OLD

This consent form will be held for a period of five (5) years.

- I have read the Information Sheet
- I agree that my child may participate in this study under the conditions set out in the Information Sheet.

Signature: _____ **Date:** _____

Full Name (printed): _____

Appendix M

Massey University
Te Kunenga ki Pūrehuroa

SCREENING QUESTIONNAIRE
TO DETERMINE THE APPROVAL PROCEDURE

(Part A and Part B of this questionnaire must both be completed)

Name: Jami Kimbrough Wallace
Project Title: Gifted and Talented Education in Aotearoa New Zealand: A Primary Perspective

This questionnaire should be completed following, or as part of, the discussion of ethical issues.

Part A

The statements below are being used to determine the risk of your project causing physical or psychological harm to participants and whether the nature of the harm is minimal and no more than is normally encountered in daily life. The degree of risk will then be used to determine the appropriate approval procedure.

If you are in any doubt you are encouraged to submit an application to one of the University's ethics committees.

Does your Project involve any of the following?
(Please answer all questions. Please circle either YES or NO for each question)

Risk of Harm

1.	Situations in which the researcher may be at risk of harm.	YES (NO)
2	Use of questionnaire or interview, whether or not it is anonymous which might reasonably be expected to cause discomfort, embarrassment, or psychological or spiritual harm to the participants.	YES (NO)
3.	Processes that are potentially disadvantageous to a person or group, such as the collection of information which may expose the person/group to discrimination.	YES (NO)
4.	Collection of information of illegal behaviour(s) gained during the research which could place the participants at risk of criminal or civil liability or be damaging to their financial standing, employability, professional or personal relationships.	YES (NO)
5.	Collection of blood, body fluid, tissue samples, or other samples.	YES (NO)
6.	Any form of exercise regime, physical examination, deprivation (e.g. sleep, dietary).	YES (NO)
7.	The administration of any form of drug, medicine (other than in the course of standard medical procedure), placebo.	YES (NO)
8.	Physical pain, beyond mild discomfort.	YES (NO)
9.	Any Massey University teaching which involves the participation of Massey University students for the demonstration of procedures or phenomena which have a potential for harm.	YES (NO)

Informed and Voluntary Consent

10. Participants whose identity is known to the researcher giving oral consent rather than written consent (if participants are anonymous you may answer No).	YES (NO)
11. Participants who are unable to give informed consent.	YES (NO)
12. Research on your own students/pupils.	YES (NO)
13. The participation of children (seven (7) years old or younger).	YES (NO)
14. The participation of children under sixteen (16) years old where active parental consent is not being sought.	YES (NO)
15. Participants who are in a dependent situation, such as those who are under custodial care, or residents of a hospital, nursing home or prison or patients highly dependent on medical care.	YES (NO)
16. Participants who are vulnerable.	YES (NO)
17. The use of previously collected identifiable personal information or research data for which there was no explicit consent for this research.	YES (NO)
18. The use of previously collected biological samples for which there was no explicit consent for this research.	YES (NO)

Privacy/Confidentiality Issue

19. Any evaluation of organisational services or practices where information of a personal nature may be collected and where participants or the organisation may be identified.	YES (NO)

Deception

20. Deception of the participants, including concealment and covert observations.	YES (NO)

Conflict of Interest

21. Conflict of interest situation for the researcher (e.g. is the researcher also the lecturer/teacher/treatment-provider/colleague or employer of the research participants or is there any other power relationship between the researcher and research participants?)	YES (NO)

Compensation to Participants

22. Payments or other financial inducements (other than reasonable reimbursement of travel expenses or time) to participants.	YES (NO)

Procedural

23. A requirement by an outside organisation (e.g. a funding organisation or a journal in which you wish to publish) for Massey University Human Ethics Committee approval.	YES (NO)

Part B

FOR PROPOSED HEALTH AND DISABILITY RESEARCH ONLY

Not all health and disability research requires review by a Health and Disability Ethics Committee (HDEC).

Your study is likely to require HDEC review if it involves:

- **human participants recruited in their capacity as:**
  - **consumers of health or disability support services; or**
  - **relatives or caregivers of such consumers; or**
  - **volunteers in clinical trials; or**
- **human tissue; or**
- **health information.**

In order to establish whether or not HDEC review is required: (i) read the Massey University Digest of the HDEC Scope of Review standard operating procedure; (ii) work through the 'Does your study require HDEC review?' flowchart; and (iii) answer Question 24 below.

If you are still unsure whether your project requires HDEC approval, please email the Ministry of Health for advice (hdecs@moh.govt.nz) and keep a copy of the response for your records.

24. Is HDEC review required for this study?	YES (NO)

Select the appropriate procedure to be used (choose one option):

If you answer **YES** to any of the questions 1 to 23 (Part A) and **NO** to Q24 in Part B	If you answer **YES** to question 24 (Part B)	If you answer **NO** to all of the questions in Parts A and B*
↓	↓	↓
Prepare an application using the MUHEC Application Pack	**Prepare an application using the Health & Disability Ethics Committee Application Form**	**Prepare a Low Risk Notification** ** Note- researchers who are new to the University, new to research with human participants or have significant other reasons, are welcome to send in a full MUHEC application, even if the Screening Questionnaire questions have all been answered "no".*
↓	↓	↓

GO BACK TO APPROVAL PROCEDURES, STEP 4, AND DOWNLOAD THE INFORMATION REQUIRED.

http://www.massey.ac.nz/massey/research/research-ethics/human-ethics/forms-and-procedures.cfm

Appendix N

(All notifications are to be typed)
(Do not modify the content or formatting of this document in any way)

Massey University
Te Kunenga ki Pūrehuroa

NOTIFICATION OF LOW RISK RESEARCH/EVALUATION INVOLVING HUMAN PARTICIPANTS

Staff researchers and supervisors are fully responsible for ensuring that the information in this form meets the requirements and guidelines for submission of a Low Risk Notification

SECTION A:

1. **Project Title** Gifted and Talented Education in Aotearoa New Zealand: A Primary Perspective

Projected start date for data collection 14 October 2015 **Projected end date** 31 December 2015

(Low risk notifications must not be submitted if recruitment and/or data collection has already begun.)

2. **Applicant Details** *(Select one box only and complete details)*

ACADEMIC STAFF NOTIFICATION

Full Name of Staff Applicant/s

School/Department/Institute

Region *(mark one only)* **Albany** ☐ **Palmerston North** ☐ **Wellington** ☐

Telephone **Email Address**

STUDENT NOTIFICATION

Full Name of Student Applicant Jami Lynn Kimbrough Wallace

Postal Address [redacted]

Telephone [redacted] **Email Address** [redacted]

Employer [redacted]

Full Name of Supervisor(s) Dr Tracy Riley & Dr Judith Donaldson

School/Department/Institute Institute of Education

Region *(mark one only)* **Albany** ☐ **Palmerston North** ☒ **Wellington** ☐

Telephone [redacted] **Email Address** [redacted]

GENERAL STAFF NOTIFICATION

Full Name of Applicant

Section

Region *(mark one only)* **Albany** ☐ **Palmerston North** ☐ **Wellington** ☐

Telephone **Email Address**

Full Name of Line Manager

Section

Telephone **Email Address**

3 Type of Project *(provide detail as appropriate)*

Staff Research/Evaluation:		Student Research:		If other, please specify:
Academic Staff		Name of Qualification	MEd	
General Staff		Credit Value of Research (e.g. 30, 60, 90, 120, 240, 360)	90	
Evaluation				

4. Describe the process that has been used to discuss and analyse the ethical issues present in this project.
(Please refer to the Low Risk Guidelines on the Massey University Human Ethics Committee website)

I have read and discussed with my supervisors the Code of Ethical Conduct for Research, Teaching and Evaluations Involving Human Participants. Likewise, I have worked through the Human Ethics Application form and completed the Screening Questionnaire to Determine the Approval Procedure.

My supervisors have consulted on the Information Sheets, Consent Forms, Interview Schedules, Questionnaires, Authority for Release of Tape Transcripts, Confidentiality Agreement form and the Letter requesting access to an institution. We have also arranged how the research will be conducted (e.g. how will questionnaires be distributed and collected).

We have discussed how to best incorporate children over the age of seven into the study so that they can give their own informed consent, as well as their parents giving consent. This has included the need to use age-appropriate language in the information sheet and consent form.

As a current practitioner, we also revised conflict of interests that may arise if I choose a school in which I currently teach. The importance of not recruiting a school in which my children or the children of family or friends are enrolled has been likewise noted.

Anonymity, confidentiality and the secure storage of data have also been reviewed.

Furthermore, we have discussed the relevance of this study and how it fits into the broader research undertaken by the Institute of Education.

5. Summary of Project

Please outline the following (in no more than 200 words):

1. **The purpose of the research, and**
2. **The methods you will use.**

(Note: ALL the information provided in the notification is potentially available if a request is made under the Official Information Act. In the event that a request is made, the University, in the first instance, would endeavour to satisfy that request by providing this summary. Please ensure that the language used is comprehensible to all)

The **purpose** of this research is to examine the provisions for gifted and talented students in New Zealand. In 2005, the Ministry of Education updated the National Administration Guidelines (NAGs) for schools; gifted and talented students are now explicitly mentioned in NAG 1. A range of initiatives were introduced in the years following the NAG update. Moltzen (2011) notes that, more recently, the advancement of gifted and talented education has slowed. Likewise, findings from Riley and Bicknell's (2013) study suggest gifted and talented education may be idling. The authors note the small sample

size that "disproportionately represents the secondary school sector" (Riley & Bicknell, 2013, n.p.). Thus, this study is designed to further the current knowledge of provisions for gifted learners in New Zealand schools by providing an additional snapshot of gifted and talented education in a primary context.

The **methodology** for this case study will be:

- Interviews – senior management and the teacher-in-charge of gifted and talented education
- Focus Group – up to 6 teachers representing a cross-section of the teaching staff
- Surveys – parents and students over seven years of age (parental consent will be sought)
- Document analysis – including strategic plans, written policies, and individual education plans

References

Moltzen, R. (2011). Historical perspectives. In. R. Moltzen (Ed.), *Gifted and talented: New Zealand perspectives* (3rd ed., pp. 1-30). Auckland, New Zealand: Pearson.

Riley, T., & Bicknell, B. (2013). Gifted and talented education in New Zealand Schools: A Decade Later. *APEX: The New Zealand Journal of Gifted Education, 18*(1). Retrieved from www.giftedchildren.org.nz/apex.

Please submit this Low Risk Notification (with the completed Screening Questionnaire) as follows:

1. For staff based at either the Palmerston North or Wellington campus; and students whose Chief Supervisor is based at either the Palmerston North or Wellington campus:

External Mailing Address	**Internal Mailing Address**
Ethics Administrator	Ethics Administrator
Research Ethics Office	Research Ethics Office
Massey University	Courtyard Complex, PN221
Private Bag 11222	Turitea
Palmerston North 4442	**Palmerston North**

2. For staff based at the Albany campus and students whose Chief Supervisor is based at the Albany campus:

External Mailing Address	**Internal Mailing Address**
Ethics Administrator	Ethics Administrator
Research Ethics Office	Research Ethics Office
Massey University	Room 3.001B, Level 3
Private Bag 102904	Quadrangle A Building
North Shore City 0745	**Albany Campus**

SECTION B: DECLARATION *(Complete appropriate box)*

ACADEMIC STAFF RESEARCH

Declaration for Academic Staff Applicant

I have read the Code of Ethical Conduct for Research, Teaching and Evaluations involving Human Participants. I understand my obligations and the rights of the participants. I agree to undertake the research as set out in the Code of Ethical Conduct for Research, Teaching and Evaluations involving Human Participants. My Head of Department/School/Institute knows that I am undertaking this research. I confirm that this submission meets the requirements set out in the Guidelines for Low Risk Notifications and that the information contained in this notification is to the very best of my knowledge accurate and not misleading.

Staff Applicant's Signature _____ Date: _____

STUDENT RESEARCH

Declaration for Student Applicant

I have read the Code of Ethical Conduct for Research, Teaching and Evaluations involving Human Participants and discussed the ethical analysis with my Supervisor. I understand my obligations and the rights of the participants. I agree to undertake the research as set out in the Code of Ethical Conduct for Research, Teaching and Evaluations involving Human Participants. I confirm that this submission meets the requirements set out in the Guidelines for Low Risk Notifications and that the information contained in this notification is to the very best of my knowledge accurate and not misleading.

Student Applicant's Signature  Date: 27-8-2015

Declaration for Supervisor

I have assisted the student in the ethical analysis of this project. As supervisor of this research I will ensure that the research is carried out according to the Code of Ethical Conduct for Research, Teaching and Evaluations involving Human Participants. I confirm that this submission meets the requirements set out in the Guidelines for Low Risk Notifications.

Supervisor's Signature _____ Date: _____

Print Name _____

GENERAL STAFF RESEARCH/EVALUATIONS

Declaration for General Staff Applicant

I have read the Code of Ethical Conduct for Research, Teaching and Evaluations involving Human Participants and discussed the ethical analysis with my Supervisor. I understand my obligations and the rights of the participants. I agree to undertake the research as set out in the Code of Ethical Conduct for Research, Teaching and Evaluations involving Human Participants. I confirm that this submission meets the requirements set out in the Guidelines for Low Risk Notifications and that the information contained in this notification is to the very best of my knowledge accurate and not misleading.

General Staff Applicant's Signature _____ Date: _____

Declaration for Line Manager

I declare that to the best of my knowledge, this notification complies with the Code of Ethical Conduct for Research, Teaching and Evaluations involving Human Participants and that I have approved its content and agreed that it can be submitted.

Line Manager's Signature _____ Date: _____

Print Name _____

Appendix O

MASSEY UNIVERSITY
ALBANY

7 September 2015

Jami Wallace
[redacted]

Dear Jami

Re: Gifted and Talented Education in Aotearoa New Zealand: A Primary Perspective

Thank you for your Low Risk Notification which was received on 31 August 2015.

Your project has been recorded on the Low Risk Database which is reported in the Annual Report of the Massey University Human Ethics Committees.

You are reminded that staff researchers and supervisors are fully responsible for ensuring that the information in the low risk notification has met the requirements and guidelines for submission of a low risk notification.

The low risk notification for this project is valid for a maximum of three years.

Please notify me if situations subsequently occur which cause you to reconsider your initial ethical analysis that it is safe to proceed without approval by one of the University's Human Ethics Committees.

Please note that travel undertaken by students must be approved by the supervisor and the relevant Pro Vice-Chancellor and be in accordance with the Policy and Procedures for Course-Related Student Travel Overseas. In addition, the supervisor must advise the University's Insurance Officer.

A reminder to include the following statement on all public documents:

> *"This project has been evaluated by peer review and judged to be low risk. Consequently, it has not been reviewed by one of the University's Human Ethics Committees. The researcher(s) named above are responsible for the ethical conduct of this research.*
>
> *If you have any concerns about the conduct of this research that you wish to raise with someone other than the researcher(s), please contact Dr Brian Finch, Director (Research Ethics), telephone 06 356 9099, extn 86015, e-mail humanethics@massey.ac.nz".*

Please note that if a sponsoring organisation, funding authority or a journal in which you wish to publish requires evidence of committee approval (with an approval number), you will have to provide a full application to one of the University's Human Ethics Committees. You should also note that such an approval can only be provided prior to the commencement of the research.

Yours sincerely

B T Finch.

Brian T Finch (Dr)
Chair, Human Ethics Chairs' Committee and
Director (Research Ethics)

cc Dr Tracy Riley and Dr Judith Donaldson
Institute of Education
Palmerston North

Professor John o'Neill
Director of Education
Palmerston North

Appendix P

MASSEY UNIVERSITY
INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
TE KURA O TE MATAURANGA

Gifted and Talented Education in Aotearoa New Zealand: A Primary School Perspective

IN-DEPTH INTERVIEW CONSENT FORM

This consent form will be held for a period of five (5) years.

- I have read the Information Sheet.
- The purpose of the study has been explained to me.
- My questions have been answered to my satisfaction.
- I understand that I may ask further questions at any time.
- I agree to the interview being audiotaped.
- I understand that I may ask for the audiotape to be turned off at any time during the interview.
- I agree to participate in this study under the conditions set out in the Information Sheet.

Signature: _____ **Date:** _____

Full Name (printed): _____

Appendix Q

MASSEY UNIVERSITY
INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
TE KURA O TE MĀTAURANGA

Gifted and Talented Education in Aotearoa New Zealand: A Primary School Perspective

FOCUS GROUP INTERVIEW CONSENT FORM

This consent form will be held for a period of five (5) years.

- I have read the Information Sheet.
- The purpose of the study has been explained to me.
- My questions have been answered to my satisfaction.
- I understand that I may ask further questions at any time.
- I agree to the interview being audiotaped.
- I understand that I may ask for the audiotape to be turned off at any time during the interview.
- I agree to participate in this study under the conditions set out in the Information Sheet.

Signature: _____ **Date:** _____

Full Name (printed): _____

Appendix R

MASSEY UNIVERSITY
INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
TE KURA O TE MĀTAURANGA

Gifted and Talented Education in Aotearoa New Zealand: A Primary School Perspective

CONFIDENTIALITY AGREEMENT

I ..... (Full Name - printed)

agree to keep confidential all information concerning the project *Gifted and Talented Education in Aotearoa New Zealand: A Primary School Perspective*.

I will not retain or copy any information involving the project.

Signature: ..... **Date:** .....

Te Kunenga ki Pūrehuroa
Institute of Education
Cnr Albany Drive & Collinson Road, Private Bag 11222, Palmerston North 4442, New Zealand T 06 356 9099 www.massey.ac.nz