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Abstract

In this handbook, innumerable achievements, issues, and concerns were considered about researching gifted education and educating gifted and talented students in the Asia-Pacific and rim nations. Not including the introductory and the concluding chapters, 62 chapters were divided amongst the six parts of the handbook, ranging from 8 to 13 chapters to a section. This large corpus of chapters makes for a diverse range of ideas, theories, discourse, research, content, and practical applications to nurture the talent development of gifted children, youth, and adults and support families, educators, researchers, mentors, and advocates. A number of issues and associated implications evolved from these six sections and some of these will be reiterated in this chapter. It is hoped that reading the chapters in this handbook will encourage even more scholarly reflection, interdisciplinary research, collaborative action, and some new directions to support talent development both within this region and beyond.
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Introduction

For the first time, researchers and educators from around all the Asia-Pacific and rim nations were invited to express their views and collaboratively report their research, discourse, and practice in a handbook. A comprehensive manuscript evolved from this invitation and innumerable issues and perspectives unique to the research and practice in these nations were raised, that both reiterated and built upon the international literature in the field. So, what are the implications that derived from the authors’ submissions in this handbook from around the Asia-Pacific and rim nations? The authors in this handbook raised too many issues and implications to mention every one of them here. Hence, only some are summarised in the following, with some links made between foci and across countries and chapters.

Key Issues and Implications

As a field, some aims are to progress:

- From fragmented research and practice to collaborative multidisciplinary research and practice.
- From theoretical models to effective research and practice for talent development.
- Towards closing the gap between theoretical models and practical implementation.
- From underachievement and underrepresentation to talent development for diversity.
From Fragmented Research and Practice to Collaborative Multidisciplinary Research and Practice

If there is one similarity across all of the Asia-Pacific countries, research that underscores effective gifted education practice is thriving due to the commitment of dedicated researchers, educators, families, mentors, and advocates (e.g., VanTassel-Baska & Brown, 2015). Unfortunately, another similarity is that research, programming, and provisions for gifted students are fragmented, inconsistent, and supported in waves of agreement and unsupported in troughs of disagreement. Fortunately, with this fragmentation, there are strengths in some areas of research and practice but, unfortunately, weaknesses in others, resulting in the disconnect between theory, research, and practice.

This fragmentation is reflected in the Asia-Pacific, as it is in other parts of the world (e.g., Ambrose, VanTassel-Baska, Coleman, & Cross, 2010; Lo & Porath, 2017). For example, the issue that many of the participants in gifted education research are biased convenience samples of high achieving gifted students was raised as a clear concern by authors in this handbook. These research samples can exclude certain gifted populations, such as those who are underachieving or underrepresented, as they are rarely identified as gifted or are usually excluded from classes or programs in which the convenience samples are selected. In her chapter in this handbook, Ballam (2021) suggests that research needs to be authentically reflected upon to alleviate self-bias and be contextually based and planned around the specific participants involved.

The international call continues for more rigorous empirical research with larger datasets and diverse participants across different contexts, with control groups from the general student population or similar selective schools, and these issues are very relevant in the Asia-Pacific context as well (e.g., Plucker & Callahan, 2014; VanTassel-Baska & Brown, 2015). It remains to be seen, however, if such large-
scale investigations are possible, considering the huge amount of funds and resources required to complete such research projects.

Additionally, according to egalitarianism and the *inclusion* ideology, the gifted population is considered advantaged, special provisions can be considered elitist, and they are not viewed as a population *in need*. Hence, the type of research investigations totally focused on gifted education does not attract much funding in our part of the world. However, funding may eventuate if funding agents are sympathetic to the disadvantage that many gifted students can actually experience, such as indigeneity, twice-exceptionality, or low socio-economic background.

In the wider research, Ambrose (2015) has found that his work has benefitted from seeking answers from other disciplines. He raised a valuable issue, in that more consideration can be given to cross-disciplinary and interdisciplinary research and practice or the multidisciplinary approach where experts within different disciplines contribute to the one study. This multidisciplinary approach may encourage more collaboration between researchers and the wider community and enable collaborators to tap into additional and unique expertise, resources, and infrastructure across disciplines. Such collaborations can also reduce the research load, that is, use the research that’s already been undertaken in other disciplines or other fields and see what models, pedagogies, or strategies can be applied in gifted education. Indeed, McCluskey (2017) suggests that rather than continue to delve into the perplexity of already answered questions in the field that may or may not continue to contribute to the quicksand of an isolated field, with little respect from the wider education community, there is the need to search for new answers to new issues within the current technological and cultural contexts. The call for a paradigm shift in the field to encompass this multidisciplinary approach going forward is echoed in this handbook and elsewhere (e.g., Lo & Porath, 2017; Plucker & Callahan, 2014; Wallace, Sisk, & Senior, 2018). Some ideas presented in this handbook may contribute to that endeavour.

**From Theoretical Models to Effective Research and Practice for Talent Development**

In this handbook, three models on the conceptions of giftedness and talent were represented by experts in the field. One model, the *DMGT*, came from a Canadian scholar (Gagné, 2013, 2021) and is used mainly in Australia, Canada, and the USA, another is from the USA, the *Megamodel of Talent Development* (Olszewski-Kubilius et al., 2021) which is used mainly in the USA, the third is from Germany/Asia, being the *Actiotope Model* (Phillipson & Ziegler, 2021), and is used more widely. This in itself presents a biased perspective towards the Americentric/Eurocentric views evident in these models that echo other models in the wider research. While Australasian perspectives were considered during the creation of one of the models and cross-cultural perspectives of the implementation of the megamodel was sought, Olszewski-Kubilius et al. (2021) reflected:
all the respondents emphasised the importance of broadening the model to include socio-cultural factors that influence talent development, including the socio-political context, values, and beliefs. These concerns challenge us to think more deeply about the utility of the megamodel and how to assist educators in translating the megamodel for practice in different national contexts.

Indeed, all the authors of all the current models can pursue this goal, especially in our context, as neither the South American perspectives nor the Indigenous sensitivities appeared to have had any specific representation in any of the conceptual models. South America, like elsewhere, experiences difficulties with researching, identifying, and educating gifted students (Wechsler, Muglia, Blumen, & Bendelman, 2018). Hence, more reflection and multicountry research on the implementation of the conceptual models derived from specific Asia-Pacific and rim countries’ sociocultural perspectives are warranted.

Towards Closing the Gap Between Theoretical Models and Practical Implementation

There are still concerns that there is a huge gap between the theoretical models and the implementation of them within practice, for example, Gagné’s DMGT in the Australian context (Bannister-Tyrrell, 2017; Gagné, 2013, 2021). Additionally, there are other models that have only emerging research to support their implementation in the Asia-Pacific, but are widely used in practice (e.g., Gardner’s, 1999, *Multiple Intelligences*, though this is a conceptual framework of *intelligence* rather than of *giftedness*). Then there are other models again that have an impressive array of supportive research, but have not been applied much in the Asia-Pacific (e.g., Sternberg’s *Triarchic Theory of Giftedness*, Sternberg, 1986) with little link with the sociocultural contexts within which they are attempting implementation, while there are some with a more sound research base that have been applied within the Asia-Pacific context (e.g., Renzulli’s *Three Ring Conception of Giftedness*, Renzulli, 2005). There are benefits and concerns about each of the models (as there are of all models), but there are also beneficial similarities and differences between these models. So, these models can benefit from evaluation and exploration to determine the gaps within the models, but also the gaps in application of the models in relation to the sociocultural context to help lessen the gaps within practice.

From Underachievement and Underrepresentation to Talent Development for Diversity

Worldwide, the ‘uns’ are prevalent in gifted education: unidentified, underachievement, undeveloped talent, underserved, or underrepresented in talent programs are widely acknowledged in the literature (e.g., Plucker & Callahan, 2014). Authors in this handbook also reiterated these concerns. For example, Korean and USA colleagues Cho, Mandracchia, and Yang (2021) and Peters et al. (2021) reinforced the
concerns regarding underrepresentation of minorities in gifted education programs. Models, frameworks, and pedagogy for talent development are beneficial, but unless all student populations are considered, then the lofty ideals imparted in these pedagogical models can be marginalised. Furthermore, Peters et al. (2021) highlighted the hidden gifted, underachievers, and the underserved in the USA and implored that it is incumbent on the field to overcome underrepresentation by improving identification of and programming for previously invisible Asian-Pacific gifted students.

Swanson, Russell, and Anderson (2021), also from the USA, offer the Talent Development Academy (TDA) school-wide model as: a foundation for classroom teachers peer collaborating to model and differentiate the curriculum and instruction; provide noncognitive and neuroscience strategies; and use culturally sensitive teaching for identifying “and developing the talent in high-ability students from underrepresented, culturally, or linguistically diverse groups”. Like Burns and Martin (2021), they embedded growth-orientation within teacher practice to support the growth of the academic potential of diverse learners (Swanson et al., 2021). These authors promote educating gifted students within the general school population with opportunities for acceleration, enrichment, and other strategies that support talent development. Greater equity to allow more underserved diversely gifted populations to partake more in enrichment gifted education programs is still being called for in the wider literature (e.g., McCluskey, Treffinger, Baker, & Wiebe, 2016).

Again from the USA, in Delisle’s and Schultz’ (2021) handbook chapter, they argued for the collaboration between significant others in a gifted underachiever student’s life and called for interventions that cultivate underachievers’ sense of self, integrity, and dignity for academic success to ensue. They portend the six A’s of Autonomy, Access, Advocacy, Alternatives, Aspirations, and Approachable educators, all of which resonate many ideals we aim for in educating all our children generally, but can be aims to support gifted underachievers more specifically.

### From Cognitive Testing to Spotting Potential

The limitations of identification based solely on intelligence and cognitive testing are well researched (e.g., Phillipson & Phillipson, 2016). Alternative forms of assessment to identify underrepresented students were explored in this handbook. For example, in Australia, Munro (2021) suggested that concept mapping could be used as a form of identification—especially for gifted underachievers—enabling some discernment between students who are gifted in one domain or across several domains. “These tools can be used across the multiple domains and modified to match the learning profiles of particular cohorts. They have implications for formative assessment and the differentiation of pedagogy and curriculum.” There has been controversy regarding the use of nominations in identification processes, with the nomination of high achievers rather than high-ability students. This may be a result of the bias of contributors to this process, heavy reliance on teacher-only nominations, lack of training on using nominations, and inappropriate nomination forms, all contributing to underrepresentation of minority groups (McBee, Peters, & Miller, 2016). Additionally, there have been calls for more research on different forms of
nominations that would be most appropriate in the Asian-Pacific context. For example, in Zavala-Berbeta and De la Torre García’s (2021) handbook chapter, they suggested that a “self-nomination inventory may be a useful instrument to support the identification process of [Mexican] gifted and talented students”. They linked the value of future research for educators to understanding the reasons students nominate or do not nominate, and the connection between the use of self-nominations with variables, such as the nominee’s self-esteem and self-efficacy.

Curriculum Models inclusive of identification processes were also represented in the handbook. For example, Callahan and Azano (2021) presented the empirically validated CLEAR curriculum model and Project PLACE in their handbook chapter, with the focus on spotting potential within context rather than labouring on the limitations of out-of-reach resources for supporting diversely different gifted students. These authors also suggested an alternative identification process for rural schools embedded in place-based learning. Swanson and her colleagues (2021) also offered hope of a useful approach to identification of underachievers in the talent spotting process, within the Talent Development Academy model. Likewise, following Maker’s DISCOVER (Maker & Schiever, 2010) and the Real Engagement in Active Problem Solving (REAPS) models allows gifted students to be spotted while undertaking creative problem-solving tasks (Maker & Wearne, 2021).

From Eurocentric, Americentric, or Ethnocentric Views to Cultural Sensitivity Inclusive of Indigenous Views

Sociocultural links and comparisons were evident throughout the handbook. For example, Park and Kim (2021) examined the concept of wisdom from the Korean cultural perspective, while Walton and Vialle (2021) discussed spirituality from the Australian view. Furthermore, from the Taiwanese perspective, Albanese, Yu, and Wu (2021) explored the differences between eastern and western views in their chapter and indicated the need for socioculturally informed understandings of gifted and talented education, educational philosophies, and research methodologies in Confucian-influenced societies. They reiterated that education is the foundation of creative responses to current and future concerns about society and the environment, stating that:

Scholars, practitioners, and policymakers are indeed working hard to adapt to changing global and local challenges and opportunities. In Taiwan, rising socioeconomic inequality makes the need to reach diverse learners all the more imperative. Efforts to move away from exam-based achievement in traditional academic areas as primary criteria for the identification of ability and to open pathways to success and further development of gifts and talents must still reckon with meritocracy. As we argue in this chapter, policy intentions and the realities of practice are not yet, nor may they ever be, fully aligned. We offer an exploration of Taiwan as an example of how the engagement of educational reforms and initiatives with local sociocultural conditions is a crucial component of the outcomes of those efforts.

Furthermore, Lupkowski-Shoplik, Assouline, Wienkes, and Easter (2021) reinforced the importance of policy development, which is inclusive of the holistic needs of gifted students to span the gap between research and...
practice. Such effective policy can encourage the use of acceleration and other programming options that are more culturally relevant for highly able students.

There was also a focus on Indigenous peoples in the handbook, a student population that has been considered disadvantaged (McCluskey et al., 2016). For example, in her New Zealand chapter, Webber (2021) elaborated family, educators, and community collaboration. This is uppermost when all can nurture the gifted child “to ensure that they are aware of their mana tangata—their unique leadership potential, collective belonging, cultural connectedness, embedded achievement, and responsibilities to others”. Steeped in a culturally-based model, Webber highlighted the plight of gifted Māori students and reinforced the importance of “connectedness to their racial-ethnic identity and their sense of mana (pride, status, and esteem)” for the development of their academic engagement and social-emotional well-being. To engage gifted students and their parents, researchers can respect cultural achievements and understandings by grounding studies in “Māori realities, knowledge, and epistemologies”.

Then there’s the recognition of the need to collaborate with multiple caregivers and significant others within specific cultural communities to achieve success for gifted Australian Indigenous students (Garvis, Windsor, & Pendergast, 2021). Like Webber (2021), these authors recommended building on current successes within the Aboriginal cultures. Specifically, these authors provided five steps towards acknowledging cultural understandings of Indigenous peoples and using pedagogies that are: culturally responsive, wonder-based, generative, place-based, and prioritise engaging gifted Indigenous students.

Interdisciplinary collaborations have been encouraged in the wider literature (e.g., Ambrose, 2015; McCluskey, 2018). However, care can be taken to avoid ethnocentric approaches by the well-meaning who provide support to the so-called disadvantaged based on the researcher or educator’s own cultural beliefs, rather than respecting culture and taking guidance from those within the sociocultural context of the research or practice (McCluskey, 2018). For example, Townend, Hay, Jung, and Smith (2021) also reviewed the literature on Indigenous gifted students in Australia, but within a specific rural context. They aligned with Garvis et al. (2021), in that culturally responsive curriculum is needed to support gifted Indigenous students, but they also contended that the rural context provides unique opportunities for founding research-based interventions and culturally sensitive research in situ. The authors felt that greater funding to support culturally relevant identification procedures—such as dynamic assessment—and fairer distribution of resources with flexible provisions can help enhance talent potential in Australian Indigenous gifted students. However, funding ebbs and flows according to the political decision-makers of the time and usually there is limited, if any, funding for gifted education programs or research, though Indigenous programs and research can attract more funding support (e.g., Bicknell & Riley, 2013).

In her chapter in this handbook, Blumen (2021) examined the “challenges of gifted education in Peru that underline the advocacy efforts towards the indigenous population facing socioeconomic inequity . . . from a developmental and cross-cultural approach”. She aligned with her Australasian counterparts above, that culturally sensitive provisions are required for the Indigenous population. Blumen also concluded that research was
needed to explore differences between the conceptions of the highly gifted culturally diverse ethnic-linguistic groups with acceleration, advanced placement, and home schooling as future programming options.

**From Conformity and Meritocracy to Creativity and Innovation**

The influence of the prioritisation of conformity, standardisation, performativity, and meritocracy over creativity development looms large in education today, regardless of whether teaching gifted students or not. From China, Dai and Zhao (2021) raised credentialism, conformity for achievement, and institutionalised pathways to success as inhibitors of creativity. In Australia, Lassig (2021) indicated the value of understanding and nurturing highly creative students’ creative intelligence and engagement in learning by teaching for creativity. Here, scaffolding student learning is of note. She encouraged teachers to understand their own creativity and the different levels of creativity as these may impact the identification of creativity in their own students. There are also calls for teacher educators to teach creatively for creativity to emerge and for the directive to teach for creativity currently already in policies and curricula documents to be translated into practice. Lassig further suggested that researching the promoters and inhibitors of creativity development in varying sociocultural contexts would be worthwhile progressing forward. It is encouraging that a recent USA study found that there was a large focus on developing creativity skills in pull-out classes for gifted students; however, this is a focus that can be applied in the general classroom too (Long et al., 2019).

A multicountry collaboration by Cramond et al. (2021) examined trends and challenges in creativity developed in selected Asian countries. Some of the recommendations from their handbook chapter included: the need for “systematic changes in education programs and policies” that include the trilogy of person-, process-, and product-focused creativity; nurturing characteristics, such as autonomy and creative thinking skills; as well as facilitating creative attitudes for creative outcomes.

Like Albanese et al. (2021), Dai and Zhao (2021) implored the need to be aware of the differences between east and western cultures’ values regarding PISA results and the link with innovation. They contended that there is the need to “educate our bright and talented minds to be more adaptive and innovative [which] is the main challenge facing educators for the twenty-first century”. This education requires cultural sensitivity and cultural change that encompasses teaching for creativity, creativity development, interest-based choices, self-exploration, and entrepreneurship for nonconventional talent development.

**Towards Frameworks to Support Creativity Development**

For creativity development, Higuchi, Saegusa, and Kim (2021) reported the consistent use of a teacher dual-support system to scaffold students’ drawing and writing about innovations in journals within the *Idea-Marathon System* (IMS) in a university
course in Japan. They believe that real innovations derive from this process if it is consistent over four months and provided some successful examples. They also believe that talented students can be identified through the IMS process, but further research is required to support their hypotheses.

South Korean views of scaffolding creativity for innovation using a research-based model, the Climates, Attitudes, and Thinking skills (CATs) model were elaborated by Kim and Lee (2021) in their chapter in this handbook. The authors contended scaffolding creativity development results in innovation and the focus should be on the 4S attitudes and climates connected to the four seasons metaphorically that are: Storm-related expertise based on interests; Soil-related critical thinking; Sun- and Space-related climates and attitudes of problem-solving; and all 4S’s are related to creating a new innovation.

**From Social and Emotional Characteristics to Social and Emotional Learning**

It is well known in the literature that catering for the holistic needs of the gifted nurtures their social-emotional needs as well (Gross, 2010; Smith, 2017). Social and emotional development requires going beyond identifying mere characteristics to scaffolding to enable students to learn new skills relevant to specific social contexts. Hence, Social-Emotional Learning (SEL) processes are needed to guide social-emotional development.

In the handbook, a number of issues and implications arose, which were contextually mediated. For example, Stoeger, Balestrini, and Steinbach (2021) explored cross-cultural aspects of Self-Regulated Learning (SRL) for gifted students in the Asia-Pacific and recommended more collaborative research on mixed-cultural general classroom students’ “cognitive, metacognitive, and motivational components of SRL” and their achievements.

Furthermore, Overexcitabilities (OE) are “inextricably bound to human potential, which is integral to human development” said Canadian scholar, Mendaglio (2021). His message is that researchers need to use the full Theory of Positive Disintegration (TPD) in their research as questionnaires alone are inadequate for assessing OEs and giftedness, unless they are designed within mixed-method studies founded fully on Dabrowski’s (1964) TPD.

In the wider literature, Kanevsky (2011, 2019) also reinforced the need for scaffolding student learning contextually and not assuming the gifted child already knows how to undertake a task productively without support. However, scaffolding is rarely associated with gifted learners as they are misconceived as advantaged and not needing much support (Smith, 2017). The issue of scaffolding was raised by a number of authors in this handbook and is particularly pertinent for SEL, as gifted students still require support for social-emotional development. For example, Cho et al. (2021) used the acronym RED to Recognise strengths, efforts and improvement, Expect High, and Differentiation in the Korean context. Teachers can scaffold instructions, provide flexible grouping, complex content, challenging tasks, and metacognition for supporting language skills and overall academic achievement of potentially talented ELs so high motivation, autonomy, and risk-
taking evolve. The importance of the teacher/student relationship is paramount for the success of teaching and learning in this context (Hertzog, 2017). As New Zealander Ballam (2021) said, being in minority ethnicities and in low socio-economic contexts can inhibit Indigenous students’ resilience development. She emphasised that if resilience is to be developed and enhanced then there is the need for ‘caring and supportive relationships’ in developing the students’ ‘sense of identity’. Gómez-Arizaga and Conejeros-Solar (2021) also reinforced the need for “meaningful and constructive peer and teacher relationships with 2e students”, the respect for diversity, acceptance of difference, and the focus on student strengths which can influence the quality of the classroom climate needed to support Chilean twice-exceptional students. More specifically, in Blackburn and Townend’s (2021) handbook chapter, they also reiterated the need to provide twice-exceptional ASD girls with support, which raised the gender issue. Wood (2021) also studied Australian gifted girls, but in a rural context and found that Australian rural adolescent gifted girls need opportunities to explore their own giftedness in order for their potential talent to be developed, so connectedness to their rural environment for place-based talent development is encouraged, which is similar to Garvis et al.’s (2021) recommendation for placed-based pedagogy in Aboriginal contexts and Callahan and Azano’s (2021) recommendation for place-based learning in early childhood contexts. However, Wood incorporates popular culture more explicitly in her model conceptualising talent development, in line with Gagné’s DMGT (Gagné, 2013). She calls for research on the disruptive and supportive impacts of popular culture on the education of diverse rural gifted girls to nurture talent development. This focus is timely, as the impact of popular culture has become more evident in society in general with the outcomes of social media on the Internet contributing to both constructive and negative outcomes. The devastating news stories on television or the Internet in particular can have a profound impact on sensitive young gifted youth who may feel more empathetically and express emotions more readily than their same-age typical peers (Smith & Laura, 2009). In contrast, the benefits of technological resources and online learning for gifted students are evident, particularly for developing self-efficacy, motivation, and self-regulation as suggested by Fung, Yuen, and Yuen (2021) from Hong Kong. In the wider research literature, Periathiruvadi and Rinn (2012) imparted that the use of technology and the Internet can be an individual creative outlet as well as provide differentiated learning opportunities, such as assessing interests and strengths, scaffolding self-regulation, undertaking inquiry-based project learning, and developing problem-based skills both within the general classroom and without. Such technological tools and programs allow flexibility in teaching and learning from which gifted students can benefit. However, Bannister-Tyrell and Wood (2021) caution reliance on online resources as the primary enrichment support for rural gifted students.

Nearly a century ago, Leta Hollingworth believed that both inherited natural abilities and nurturing the educational and familial environment contributed to enhancing talent potential. Consequentially, she worked tirelessly to develop curriculum and effective enrichment strategies using biographies of creative experts to scaffold the talent development of gifted children (VanTassel-Baska & Brown,
In her handbook chapter, Diezmann (2021) chronicled the life and education of four extraordinary Australians as role models for gifted students. Scaffolding Singaporean students’ interests through social justice passion projects inspired by Picture Book Biographies (PBBs) of eminent peoples can support the growth orientation of gifted students. Through the use of authentic visual narratives of those who have excelled, gifted students can come to the realisation that excellence requires hard work and resiliency (Garces-Bacsal, 2021). This connects with Australians Burns’ and Martin’s (2021) notion of growth orientation, which is also in line with Dweck’s (2017) growth mindset theory. As such, the influence of growth orientation involves a greater exploration of growth goal setting and growth mindset and how these influence students’ outcomes. Indeed, to support talent development, Burns and Martin recommended investigating both the predictors and the outcomes of gifted students’ motivation for learning. They also imparted that, “future work may consider examining the antecedents of gifted students’ motivation, such as the role of personal relationships and classroom climate, each of which are salient predictors of motivation in ‘general’ populations’.

As David Dai (2021) states in this handbook, “one of the purposes of gifted education is to prepare youth for solving pressing problems in the world.” Young gifted visionaries, crusaders, philanthropists, entrepreneurs, inventors, innovators, pioneers, and activists who actioned their altruism in pre-teen and teenage years example some of these: Swedish Greta Thunberg, is a young environmental activist, who has the social gift of galvanising school students and adults globally for youth climate change for environmental sustainability; in 1995, 10-year-old American Aubyn C. Burnside used his empathy and innovation to co-found Suitcases for Kids to provide suitcases for foster children; Pakistani Malala Yousafzai escaped an assassination attempt, used her social advocacy to create the Malala Fund that advocates for women's rights, and is a role model for girls’ education. She became the youngest Nobel prize winner in history; Fijian Timoci Naulusala uses his social-emotional gifts to crusade for climate change and subsequently, young people’s security and well-being; Syrian Bana Alabed is a talented author who documented the atrocities of war in Aleppo, advocates for peace, and received the Atlantic Council Freedom Award; over a decade ago, African Zambian Thandiwe Chama, a gifted adolescent, was awarded the 2007 International Children’s Peace Prize and still uses her social-emotional strengths to campaign for the rights of those living with HIV/AIDS; Indonesian Balinese 10-year-old Melati Wijsen and her 12-year-old sister Isabel used their social strengths to start a campaign for reducing plastics; American/Cuban Emma González co-founded Never Again MSD and has committed her life to decreasing gun violence; English Siena Castellon has autism and learning difficulties and is gifted intellectually and socially, is a neurodiversity advocate and anti-bullying activist, she created a website to mentor autistic students, is an author, created the #AlwaysBeKind Instagram campaign, and is a multi-award winner (e.g., Points of Light, Diana Award, and British Citizen Youth Award, BBC Radio 1 Teen Hero Award); Gifted in many ways, Indian West Bengali Anoyara Khatun campaigns to work with the Save the Children foundation to create children’s advocacy groups to help stop child trafficking, labor exploitation, and child marriage; and, demonstrating his creativity and social giftedness, Dutch Boyan Slat’s non-profit
Ocean Clean-up for plastic reduction originated when he was a teenager. There are many more children and adolescents using their gifts altruistically around the world. It is hoped that gifted research and education can assist them in their endeavors. As gifted adults strive to find peaceful, equitable, inclusive, and transformative outcomes through the Black Lives Matter Movement and solutions to the Coronavirus pandemic crisis, and other crises, again we acknowledge that education, equitable access to resources, and opportunities can allow gifted people to develop their creativity, social-emotional, and intellectual and other gifts for their own good and — if they so choose — for the good of humanity worldwide.

Socioculturally, socio-economically, and social-emotionally, I wish everyone well and safe during the unprecedented and uncertain times within which this handbook emerged. While this handbook was conceived well before the 2020 Black Lives Matter Movement or the COVID-19 Pandemic, both of which have gripped the global community in inconceivable ways, causing unparalleled and unexpected outcomes, the handbook was born within a global culture where inequities, discrimination, misogyny, chauvinism, despotism, racism, fanaticism, ageism, sizeism, and many other forms of discriminatory “isms” are still rife. One reason for developing this handbook was to address many of these inequities in the education of gifted students and to celebrate the diverse students, parents, academics, educators, advocates, and the like who strive to respect cultural diversity, neurodiversity, and other differences in education. Those who are: living with open-heartedness not closed-mindedness; respecting and being kind to everyone, not bullying those conceived as weaker; peacefully expressing views and calling for attitudinal change not hostility; creating a safe, inclusive, and transformative future, not provoking divisiveness, hatred, and violence; or the giving of themselves to enhance life, not taking it for selfish individual self-aggrandisement; amongst many other polarising perspectives, are the inspirations for future leadership.

From the South Korean perspective, Lee, Kim, and Boo (2021) contended that teachers can prepare leaders of tomorrow to address today’s and tomorrow’s diverse global twenty-first-century concerns, such as the uncertainty of pandemics, the exponential growth of environmental destruction, the singularity of machine intelligence, the existential risk of overpopulation and civil unrest, the steep growth of cyber-bullying, the increased threat of terrorism, or increasing homelessness. The authors match the skills needed for leadership with those often cited as needed in the twenty-first century, such as problem-solving, critical and creative thinking, communication, open-mindedness, respect for diversity, collaboration, conflict management, and empathy and suggested that “a well-designed leadership program”, role-modelling, and SEL mentoring can help develop these skills in gifted students.

From Curriculum Models to Research-Based Pedagogy Models in Practice

There are a number of curriculum and pedagogy models presented in the handbook and their applications have been applied differently in different sociocultural
contexts, which are derived from diverse research. Some of them are well known and used intermittently; some are more strongly research-based, while others are not.

**From Differentiation or Personalisation or Attuned Pedagogy?**

Today there is still debate between differentiation and personalisation (e.g., Bevan-Brown, McGee, Ward, & MacIntyre, 2011; Yuen et al., 2018; VanTassel-Baska & Brown, 2015). While personalised learning appears to align closely with differentiated instruction, the broader definition of differentiation incorporates much more than differentiated instruction, such as differentiating teaching, learning, content, processes, products, assessment, resources, and outcomes individually and in different grouping contexts (e.g., Maker & Schiever, 2010; Reis & Renzulli, 2015; Smith, 2015; Tomlinson & Reis, 2004). Differentiation is not just using many different strategies miscellaneous, but differentiation is the careful planning of evidence-based curriculum, assessment, strategies, and programs for individual learning student needs within varying grouping contexts both within and outside the general classroom (Smith, 2015). Notably, VanTassel-Baska and Brown (2015) query whether differentiation is actually applied for gifted students and implore educators to use the effective practices—derived from the gifted education research and otherwise—that are relevant for all students in the general education context, inclusive of gifted students.

In Lu and Chen’s (2021) chapter in this handbook they added another dimension to this debate, and that is *attuned pedagogy*. They suggested that the uniqueness of the individual, professional relationships, and matching the student needs with attuned personalised connections with their learning readiness, their discipline for learning, and their natural desire for achievement can initiate their talent potential. Though the Actiotope model is not mentioned in their chapter, *attuned pedagogy* aligns with Zeigler’s Actiotope model, in that the focus is not on the gifted child, but contextually focused on mastering the social-cultural learning environment and seeking “wisdom based on professional knowledge and judgement”, imagination, and diversity to enhance learning potential.

Several authors in this handbook discussed differentiation for talent development in their chapters (e.g., Cho et al., 2021; Maker & Wearne, 2021; Munro, 2021; Swanson et al., 2021; VanTassel-Baska, Hubbard, & Robbins, 2021). For example, Maker (1982) extended her original differentiation model with a recent Australian study (Maker & Wearne, 2021) and provided recommendations for identifying advanced problem-solving skills and differentiating for talent development using the REAPS model. Advantages of the REAPS model are that it has been researched within Australasian and Pacific rim contexts and can be applied within the general classroom with all students regardless of their level of ability.

There are many program models and curriculum approaches not mentioned in the handbook that have been validated by sound research, so educators have many choices to support effective practice for talent development (e.g., Gardner, 1999; Renzulli, 2005; Sternberg, 1986; Tomlinson et al., 2009; VanTassel-Baska & Brown, 2007, 2015). However, Grant and Morrissey (2021) recommend there is “a pressing
research need to validate suitable curriculum and pedagogical approaches” in the Australian early childhood field. Indeed, there is a pressing need for evaluations across all the models and frameworks currently used! In regard to the effectiveness of these models, VanTassel-Baska and Brown’s (2007) criteria can be applied to any new curriculum models or well-used models that have not been effectively evaluated. Additionally, more meta-analyses of programs and curriculum models may progress more rigorous support for gifted students in practice. These may be steps forward for validating the models currently used to frame assessment, curricula, and pedagogy in the Asia-Pacific and rim nations. Many of the models originally validated by the VanTassel-Baska and Brown assessment (e.g., The Stanley Model of Talent Identification and Development, The Renzulli & Reis Schoolwide Enrichment Triad Model [SEM], 2014, Sternberg’s Triarchic Componential Model, 1986) have been used sporadically in the Asia-Pacific region, but VanTassel-Baska and Brown’s evaluation criteria are yet to be applied to any of these models in this region since their seminal work on them was focused in the USA. Hence, care needs to be taken to ensure the appropriate sociocultural considerations of using the chosen models in the Asia-Pacific contexts more widely.

**From Exclusion to Teaching Developmentally and Inclusively**

Teaching developmentally is inclusive and holistic practice that entails supporting the academic, social, emotional, physical, cultural, and spiritual (Walton & Vialle, 2021) needs of all students at different levels of the educational continuum, such as students with special needs, typical grade students, and students with giftedness (Moltzen, 2006). In order to accomplish teaching developmentally according to learning readiness, Grant and Morrisey (2021) suggested the use of the sociocultural approach to curriculum and pedagogy, that is inclusive of gifted students in the general classroom, stating that this is one way to develop respect for various cultural beliefs and values.

Building on the work of June Maker and Carol Ann Tomlinson and other Differentiation gurus, in the wider research and practice, Kanevsky (2019) created Possibilities for Learning, an online resource to support the identification of gifted traits and strengths in relation to needed differentiated strategies. This online resource and many others available today, for example, Renzulli’s and Reis’s (2014), are beneficial to support the identification, programming, and provisions for diversely gifted students in the general education context. The benefits derive from going beyond labelling the gifted child, to focusing on their developmental readiness, strengths, behaviours, and needs matched with associated practical and differentiated support mechanisms. Maker’s (Maker & Wearne, 2021) REAPS curriculum model is again relevant here as it focuses on teaching the student when developmentally appropriate.

Research has tried to include the perspectives of students when assessing programs and provisions (e.g., Coleman, Micko, & Cross, 2015). Kanevsky (2011) reinforced the value of engaging student voice in assessing the differentiated teaching they believed they needed for effective learning. In New Zealand, Riley (2021) also used student voice to report on ability grouping—a highly supported learning environment for gifted
students (e.g., Steenbergen-Hu, Makel, & Olszewski-Kubilius, 2016)—reinforcing how important such a learning context is for developing a sense of belonging within socialisation. In Australian selective school contexts, Rogers (2021) explored gifted students’ perspectives of effective teachers and provided some informative recommendations to support the talent development of gifted students in secondary schools. For example, gifted secondary students reported that effective teachers have strong content knowledge, need to update subject area knowledge with consistent professional learning, and can examine how to address classroom behaviour and bullying. Rogers is hopeful that the study exampled in her handbook chapter is replicated with different levels of cohorts and in varying educational contexts for gifted students.

Towards Special Education, Gifted Education, or Talent Development Within General Inclusive Education?

Experts support the ‘talent development’ approach (e.g., Plucker & Callahan, 2014). On the one hand, there is the view that gifted education should be an entity on its own, while on the other the view is that it should be a part of special, inclusive, and/or general education (e.g., Moltzen, 2006; Roda, 2015; Sánchez-Escobedo, Camelo-Lavadores, & Valdés-Cuerv, 2021). Hence, researchers have promoted research and practice that bridges the general, special, and gifted populations and inclusive contexts, to encourage a shared vision that incorporates multilevel, multimodel, and multidisciplinary inclusive education for all (e.g., Renzulli & Reis, 2014; Sapon-Shevin, 2003; VanTassel-Baska & Brown, 2015). Building such bridges by combining gifted education research within general education inclusive practice may be of merit going forward, especially if access to funding is reliant in such a philosophy in practice.

From an Isolated Field to Multidisciplinary Research and Community Collaboration

Often, researchers, families, and educators of gifted students feel isolated in their context (Sapon-Shevin, 2003). Effective leadership can dissipate some isolation in practice (VanTassel-Baska & Brown, 2015). Furthermore, the field itself can be isolated. However, heeding Ambrose’s (2015) suggestion for multidisciplinary research that was mentioned earlier and collaborative research partnerships exampled in the work of Cramond et al. (2021), Sánchez-Escobedo et al. (2021), and Olszewski-Kubilius et al. (2021) in chapters in this handbook can alleviate some of this isolation.

For families and educators, tapping into community resources and personnel can help support them in their endeavour to support gifted students. For example, in a chapter from Singapore, Garces-Bacsal (2021) suggested linking the use of inspiring narratives/biographies to encourage community-based initiatives or passion projects. Community-based projects can provide the opportunity for students to develop those interests and creative skills for the twenty-first century for future innovative and productive outcomes. Furthermore, undertaking community-based research enables linking with authentic service-based initiatives to enhance reflection on local
contextual issues that may concern the gifted child and inform wider global solutions to the world’s problems hinted at earlier. Many authors in this handbook promoted scaffolding (Cho et al., 2021; Garces-Bacsal, 2021), mentoring (Horsley & Moeed, 2021; Jung, Koo, Hay, & Smith, 2021; Tan, Tan, & Chia, 2021), goal setting (Burns & Martin, 2021), and counselling (Bakar & Brody, 2021) as additional collaborative ways to support talent development.

In the Singaporean context, Tan et al. (2021) reiterated the need for a community-based approach with: scientists as mentors sharing their professional expertise; mentor training to ensure understanding of gifted students’ needs; planning; and student goal setting with monitoring and evaluation to ensure more success within the mentor/mentee relationship and in the outcomes. In New Zealand, Horsley and Moeed (2021) called for more research on the academic achievements of academically gifted students in science to investigate whether an interest-based curriculum and pedagogy with mentoring by inspirational role-models, autonomous learning, and practical learning tasks are enabling exceptional outcomes that may lead to eminence. In the handbook, Horsley’s and Moeed’s (2021) views are supported by Australian scholar Watters (2021), who adds the need for interest-based learning tasks inclusive of negotiation and choice, ability grouping with like-minded peers, and tapping into students’ curiosity to engage student learning in science. Watters links these academic needs with the support of the development of the social-emotional well-being of gifted students, with motivation being one such construct of importance here that aligns with the wider research literature (e.g., Baker, 2018; Wright-Scott, 2018) as being needed for talent to develop.

From Career Expectations to Career Choices

There has been an increased interest in the career journeys of highly able students over the last decade or so. For example, in his handbook chapter, Jung (2021) examined the career-decisions of Asia-Pacific gifted students generally and concluded that the career decisions of gifted students in this region were different to others outside the region due to the influences of their cultural backgrounds and their individual characteristics. He implored further research on this under-researched group was warranted, mainly for sociocultural reasons and to support their future career decisions across cultural contexts. Building on this career-based research, Jung et al. (2021) also called for more research on the career decision-making processes of gifted Brazilian international university students studying in STEM subjects in Australia. Support for this gifted population is also needed on campus, for example, guidance, counselling, and mentoring on employment prospects with a view to exploring the inhibitors and promoters of career decisions associated with STEM subjects. Also, Korean and Australian colleagues, Ryu, Lee, Kim, Goundar, Lee, and Jung (2021) collaborated in their chapter and they indicated that STEM was extended to STEAM in Korea to include the Arts and to encourage more interest in STEM-related subjects and careers.

With a focus on the Arts more specifically, talent development in an Australian university level music course was the emphasis of Rowley’s (2021)
handbook chapter. This author specifically presented perceptions of transitions to music careers within students’ work experience contexts. She found that engaging in dialogue and using reflective ePortfolios “on their musicality, teaching, leadership, professional musician identity, talent development to career ready musicians” enabled gifted musicians to project their expertise forward into their imagined successful future professional careers and enabled more success in actually achieving their career goals. A university course can re-orientate the “tertiary music curriculum and learning for career relevance ... to enable the development of essential, transferable skills such as critical thinking, communication, teamwork, workplace negotiation. and problem-solving for talented young musicians”. Rowley (2021) reinforced that the strategy could be applied across all disciplines making it a multi-dimensional teaching and learning approach to support career development and career choices.

**From Misconceptions to Positive Attitudes and Contextually Supported Talent Development**

Societal misconceptions that feed negative attitudes towards gifted students, gifted education, and the word ‘gifted’ in particular are rife everywhere (Smith, 2017), so much so, that the *Gifted Child Quarterly* (1982, 2009) has dedicated special editions to the issues around trying to demythologise gifted education. Perhaps it is time for another special edition on the matter? Generally, researchers and practitioners have tried to eradicate these myths or misconceptions by moving towards a talent development model and reducing the use of the word gifted to highly able, supernormal, or talented, but these myths still persist today. Many believe that the starting place to eradicating these myths and divisive attitudes is in teacher professional training.

In an Australian chapter, Plunkett and Kronborg (2021) assessed preservice teachers’ perspectives about teaching gifted students in an Initial Teacher Education (ITE) program. They concluded that there is the need for these courses in all-undergraduate programs for future teachers to be made aware of the complexities of teaching gifted and talented students. The value of nurturing positive attitudes towards gifted children, reflections on practice, and in identifying research-based strategies and programs to support highly able learners were highlighted factors in their findings. Constructive attitudes can then be translated into effective practice if the practice is also research-based. From the USA, VanTassel-Baska, Hubbard, and Robbins (2021) reiterated the care needed in teacher preservice training programs when choosing and teaching research-based differentiation strategies, especially when differentiation practice is not as evident for gifted students in practice. They reinforced the value of using professional standards to guide planning and implementation of teaching and learning for gifted students. Still others believe in tackling in-service teacher attitudes themselves. For example, Wormald and Bannister-Tyrrell’s (2021) nationwide Australian study found that in-service teachers did not even know what twice-exceptional meant!

Meanwhile, others examined the perspectives and roles of paraprofessionals who support talent development contextually. For example, in their handbook
chapter Henderson and Jarvis (2021) researched Australian Gifted Education Coordinators (GEC) who considered their roles ill-defined and inhibitors to their role to be lack of recognition, few resources, and time constraints. The authors suggested that these issues could be addressed through a shared vision of a whole school approach that incorporates further professional learning to elevate the positive profile of the GEC. The provision of more adequate resourcing that matches the coordinator’s expertise can enable the GEC to be a more effective change agent for students’ talent development to ensue. In the USA, a study conducted by Long et al. (2019) found that there is still a huge reliance on GECs taking part-time pull-out programs for gifted learners that focus on project-based learning, critical thinking, and creativity skills rather than providing advanced academics that accelerate learning, but no mention of the coordinator’s specific role or responsibilities was reported though.

Then others explored talent development in different school contexts. For example, Conejeros-Solar and Smith (2021) examined homeschooling for gifted children in Chile, Australia, and the USA. Parents have sought home education as an alternative educational context for their children due to harmful misconceptions and negative societal attitudes that have resulted in bullying and very unhappy students. Additionally, Gallagher (2021) explored the attributes, issues, and barriers to talent development in the Thai international schooling system. There is very little empirical research on either of these educational contexts. Gallagher suggested that localised policy and “taking a talent development perspective may help international schools to develop a menu of context-specific services for meeting the needs of their highly able learners that are rigorous, sustainable, defensible, and effective”. Socio-culturally context-specific services can include the trilogy of provisions including acceleration, grouping, and enrichment with differentiated strategies, such as curricular flexibility, project-based learning, service-learning opportunities, community competitions, awards, science fairs, or mentoring with staff who have the interest, expertise, and willingness to provide the support needed. These approaches can be researched in different cultural and community contexts with different student populations and control groups for rigor, especially how international schooling or homeschooling enhances or inhibits talent development for diversely gifted students in different countries.

Conclusion

This concluding chapter reviewed some of the implications for research and practice according to the views of educators in many Asia-Pacific and rim countries. The astute scholar in the field will have identified the familiar, while also noticing the new within the authors’ contributions. Effective practice that is evident in the international literature was reiterated, while providing original insights for trialling original research and practices both in the Asia-Pacific region and elsewhere. In several chapters in the handbook, preliminary studies were exampled so authors have either published results elsewhere or are encouraged to undertake deeper analyses and write up their results in more detail for journal publications and seek interdisciplinary collaborations that will inspire further research on the investigations initiated.
As authors, editors, and publisher we collaborated on this momentous task to share our vision for improved gifted education for talent development in the Asia-Pacific and rim parts of the world. We shared our perspectives, unique research, strategies, and programs that we hope will be built upon by the contributing authors and others who may be inspired by our work. Ultimately, we shared our passion for effective gifted education and provided some impetus for more constructive action to overcome underachievement and underrepresentation. In the foreword, Borland stated that, giftedness is not a universal construct, but “is profoundly shaped by the various cultures in which it is created, and that there is no such thing as giftedness divorced from a specific context”. However, “few of our ways of thinking about giftedness take sociocultural contexts into consideration”. Nearly two decades ago, Borland and colleagues (2003) also argued for a paradigm shift in gifted education, that reinforced the need for effective education for all, including gifted students. There have been many calls to educational arms over the years for a paradigm shift in gifted education, the most recent in Wallace et al. (2018) *SAGE Handbook of Gifted and Talented Education*. We would suggest that it is a call to sociocultural educational arms for a paradigm shift in education as a whole; so all students’ education is included, inclusive of the holistic needs of highly able students world-wide. After all, our ultimate goal is to support the holistic, creative, and talent development of students whoever or wherever they may be.
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