
Indigenous Conceptions of Giftedness

Jill Bevan-Brown
Massey University College of Education, New Zealand

Abstract

Giftedness can be found amongst people from all cultural, ethnic and socio-economic groups. However, what is understood as giftedness, and how it is provided for, can differ considerably between these groups. This paper briefly examines the concept of giftedness from Māori, Navajo and Australian Aboriginal perspectives. It discusses similarities and differences between these indigenous concepts of giftedness and also between indigenous and western, majority culture concepts. Problems associated with the identification of culturally diverse gifted students are outlined, three strategies to facilitate the inclusion of diverse cultural concepts of giftedness are described and ways indigenous views on giftedness can contribute to both gifted and general education are mooted. The paper concludes with a 25-item questionnaire to help teachers assess how well their school is providing for gifted students from minority cultures.

Introduction

Diversity abounds in the gifted arena. Although it is universally accepted that gifted individuals are found amongst people from all cultural, ethnic and socio-economic groups, there is continuing debate over how giftedness should be conceptualised, identified, demonstrated, fostered and provided for (Colangelo & Davis, 2003). This diversity and debate is not surprising given that giftedness is a social construct (Gardner, 1983; McAlpine, 1991; Sternberg, 1985). From a cultural perspective, the concept of giftedness is shaped by a group's beliefs, customs, needs, values, concepts, attitudes and language and as these differ between cultural groups then so too will their concepts of giftedness differ (Bevan-Brown, 1993). Different worldviews will result in different perceptions of giftedness (Phillipson, 2007). This is supported by Sternberg (2007), who, drawing on his research with children in rural Kenya and Native American Yup'ik Eskimos, concludes "that gifted can differ from one culture to another. There is no one-size-fits-all conception of giftedness" (p. xvii). McAlpine (1991) goes as far as stating that giftedness only has meaning in terms of how it reflects different social and cultural values and contexts. This paper considers how giftedness is perceived in three different indigenous cultures: Māori, Navajo and Australian Aborigine. It discusses similarities and differences among these indigenous concepts of giftedness, and between indigenous and western, majority culture concepts. It also outlines problems associated with the identification of culturally diverse gifted students and suggests strategies to incorporate different cultural concepts of giftedness.

Three indigenous conceptions of giftedness

Māori ¹

Similar to other cultural groups Māori are a diverse people; tribal and individual differences abound. Despite this, research has shown the following (see Table 1) to be components of giftedness that are supported by many Māori (Bevan-Brown, 1993, 2002).

Table 1. Components of a Māori Concept of Giftedness

| |
|---|
| 1. Giftedness is widely distributed in Māori society. It is not bound by social class, economic status, lineage or gender |
| 2. Giftedness can be exhibited in both individual and group contexts. Also, an individual's gifts and talents can be 'owned' by a group |
| 3. The areas of giftedness and talent recognised are broad and wide-ranging |
| 4. Importance is placed on both 'qualities' and 'abilities' |
| 5. The concept of giftedness is holistic in nature and inextricably intertwined with other Māori concepts |
| 6. There is an inherent expectation that a person's gifts and talents will be used to benefit others |
| 7. The Māori culture provides a firm foundation on which giftedness is grounded, nurtured, exhibited and developed |
| 8. Mana tangata ² is frequently accorded to people with special abilities especially in the areas of traditional knowledge and service to others |

These components show many areas of convergence with western, majority culture concepts of giftedness. There are, however, some notable differences, for example, group giftedness. This refers to the notion that giftedness emerges as a result of people working together. Individuals may have expertise but it is only when working in a particular group context that their expertise becomes collectively heightened to an outstanding level. The gifted ability is perceived as belonging to the group rather than to individuals within it. Collective giftedness is in keeping with the strong group orientation of Māori culture (Barlow, 1991; Mead, 2003).

An associated belief is that of group ownership of giftedness. This is related to being

¹ Māori are the indigenous people of New Zealand. They are of Polynesian origin and represent approximately 15% of New Zealand's population.

² Mana Tangata is authority or prestige bestowed on an individual or group by others.

'handed down' a quality or ability that one's whanau (extended family) or hapū (subtribe) are celebrated for. It is also related to acknowledging the contribution others have played in nurturing and enabling a person's giftedness to develop. The 'self-made man' does not fit comfortably in Māori philosophy. While individual effort is applauded especially if it involves battling against adversity, individuals themselves are viewed within the context of their whānau (Barlow, 1991; Mead, 2003). They were conceived, raised and their abilities recognised and nurtured by family members, some of whom have made personal sacrifices to provide opportunities for a relative's gifts and talents to be developed. As one research participant explained:

The talent in a person is the talent you see encapsulated in that individual, but it is a talent that belongs to the group and that's the difference. It's just the perception, how you actually view the thing. (Bevan-Brown, 1993, p. 122)

A second notable difference relates to the importance placed on intangible 'qualities' mainly in the affective, interpersonal and intrapersonal domains. These areas of giftedness are given top priority and include qualities such as: love, caring and sensitivity to others; courage; bravery; hospitality; familiness; industriousness; determination; patience, honesty, integrity, open mindedness, humility, serenity, reliability, selflessness, moral courage, humour and strength of character.

Service to others is also accorded a high priority. This ranges from service to humanity to service at a local and family level. For gifted Māori there is an inherent responsibility to use their gifts and talents to benefit others. This stems back to traditional times when it was believed that gifts were handed down from the gods, not for personal aggrandisement but to help one's whānau, hapū and iwi (tribe). A person so endowed was considered to be the guardian of a taonga (valued possession). If a gift was abused in any way, it could be withdrawn (Marsden, 1992). A contemporary interpretation of this belief was provided by a research participant:

If you share [your gifts] they go through other people and so it transcends time and keeps going, but if you keep it all to yourself, that's where it is going to stay and once you're gone, it will probably go after a while as well. (Bevan-Brown, 1993, p. 123)

In addition to the affective and social domains discussed above, other areas of giftedness valued by Māori are: spiritual, cognitive, aesthetic, artistic, musical, psychomotor, intuitive, creative, leadership and cultural knowledge and skills. Such a broad, wide-ranging concept of giftedness echoes the multicategorical approach popular in western society today and exemplified by Gagné's (2003) differentiated-talent model and Gardner's (1993) Multiple Intelligences theory. There are, however, important differences in the way the various abilities are interpreted and demonstrated. Leadership ability provides an example. While many western definitions and models include this ability, in a Māori concept of giftedness 'leadership' is interpreted from a Māori perspective. Similar to many other cultural groups, Māori have their 'up-front' leaders, and those that lead by example, but they also have a unique, unassuming 'behind-the-scenes' style of leadership described in the following quote.

People who have and hold this type of mana (prestige, charisma) are not always seen in the public eye, but are often consulted and approached within the privacy of their own kinship group. Today, people from other cultures often approach Māori people who appear to be carrying leadership roles within the formal context of the marae-atea (formal meeting ground) only to be told to approach someone else who is working quietly behind the scenes. People familiar with this type of mana have little or no difficulty recognising or 'feeling' it within other people. (Pere, 1982, p. 32)

Navajo (Dine')³

According to Begay and Maker (2007) the Navajo (or Dine') concept of giftedness is extremely complex.

People are each endowed [by the Holy People, the deities] from prebirth with a gift, and at birth it is the responsibility of the parents, grandparents, extended family and kinfolk to identify and cultivate this unique gift, ability and talent...giftedness is thus not only an individual existential experience but rather a complete, communal experience similar to the 'whole being greater than the sum of its parts.' The Dine' epistemic conceptualisation, identification, and cultivation of giftedness are deeply embedded in the spiritual world. It is not just an academic construct but is accorded the utmost profundity in respect, reverence, and observance. (Begay & Maker, 2007, p.160)

The communal experience of giftedness for Navajo can be likened to the previously described communal ownership of giftedness by some Māori whanau. Similar also is a Navajo obligation to use one's gifts to help others: "where and when geniuses fail, that is where exceptional talent and abilities are used to only one's benefit" (Begay & Maker, 2007, p. 131). There is a "form of collective cultural governance of individual exceptionality" which, together with a "balanced personal and collective conscience" serves to steer gifted individuals away from using their outstanding abilities for self-interest to using them to benefit their people and make a better world (Begay & Maker, 2007, p. 132).

The highly valued talents, abilities and wisdom contained in the Navajo conceptual framework of giftedness are grouped into four areas:

1. Purity in thought; spiritual; identify interests; good memory skills (ability to store vast amount of information, cultural knowledge; interpersonal skills (personal/social perspective, share knowledge skills); abstract thinkers (arts, patterns, math);
2. Awareness and sensitivity (kinship, community, nature etc); shows respect and reverence (kin, all people, nature life forms etc); has strong spirituality, reverence;

³ The information on the Navajo (Dine') concept of giftedness is taken from a chapter in *Conceptions of giftedness: Sociocultural perspectives*. This chapter was written principally by a Navajo man, Harold Begay. He was assisted by C. June Maker. I thank and acknowledge them for the information in this section.

3. Excellent problem solvers (convergent, divergent thinking); intrapersonal skills (spiritual, moral, ethical, reflective); adaptability (insightful, practical); maturity (responsible, disciplined work ethic);
4. Leadership (altruistic); language usage, verbal skills; listening skills (tolerance, patience, not boastful etc); highly motivated to learn; musically/artistically inclined (Begay & Maker, 2007, p. 156).

Notable in this list is the emphasis placed on affective, intrapersonal and interpersonal skills — another similarity to the Māori concept of giftedness. Begay and Maker (2007) note that, “Dine’ traditional giftedness as applied to every day life is identified most with people who are traditional healers, peacemakers, leaders and family providers, and those who possess cultural skills, knowledge and teaching” (p. 144). These same areas of expertise featured prominently in Bevan-Brown’s (1993) research on Māori giftedness.

Australian Aborigines⁴

In discussing the Australian Aboriginal view of giftedness, Gibson and Vialle (2007) acknowledge the difficulty of constructing a single aboriginal concept for people who have diverse cultures, represent 28 major language groups and speak literally hundreds of different dialects. They contend that, “any conceptualisation of giftedness from an Australian Aboriginal perspective must incorporate intellectual strengths that are inherent in their worldview” (pp. 219-220). Drawing on a variety of research into Aboriginal concepts of giftedness and their own extensive experience of working with Aboriginal communities, Gibson and Vialle (2007) propose four intellectual strengths that typify the diverse indigenous groups in Australia and should be included in an Aboriginal concept. These are:

1. Linguistic intelligence. Aboriginal languages are more syntactically complex than English (Fesl, 1993). Traditionally, Aboriginal people were multilingual, and when exposed to other languages they learned them quickly and well ...
2. Spatial intelligence... studies have emphasized the strength of Aboriginal children in learning through observation... Spatial abilities have had their most notable expression in the exceptionality of Aboriginal trackers and the world acclaim for the work of traditional and contemporary Australian Aboriginal artists.
3. Interpersonal intelligence. Australian Aboriginal cultures constitute an egalitarian society where everything is shared. Kinship is central and Aboriginal children are born into groups, not nuclear families... [They] are raised to be independent and autonomous, both qualities being pivotal in the realization of giftedness.
4. Naturalist and spiritual intelligence. The connection and respect for the land that is central to the Aboriginal worldview embraces two of Gardner’s (1998, 2000) more recent additions to his theory of multiple intelligences (although

⁴ The information on the Australian Aboriginal view of giftedness is taken from a chapter in *Conceptions of giftedness: Sociocultural perspectives*. This chapter was written by Kay Gibson and Wilma Vialle. These authors are not Aboriginal however they have worked extensively with Aboriginal communities and drew on research studies conducted either by Aboriginal Australians or in close collaboration with them. I thank and acknowledge the authors for the information in this section.

he does not accept spirituality as a full intelligence at this stage)⁵. (Gibson & Vialle, 2007, p. 220)

Gibson and Vialle could have added intrapersonal intelligence to their list above as 'inter/intrapersonal ability' was the top scoring category in a research conducted by Gibson to "determine the conceptions of giftedness held by Aboriginal people living in urban areas of Southern Queensland and to establish the usefulness of Frasier's (1992) 10 traits, aptitudes and behaviours (TABs) to identify gifted Aboriginal students in Australia" (Gibson & Vialle, 2007, p. 211). An analysis of the frequency of culturally-specific examples in this study revealed that 20 examples of inter/intrapersonal ability were given compared to 34 examples in total of Frasier's 10 traits of communication, motivation, problem-solving ability, memory, reasoning, imagination/creativity, humour, insight, interests and inquiry.

Based on these findings it would appear that, similar to Māori and Navajo concepts, interpersonal and intrapersonal skills have a high priority in an Aboriginal concept of giftedness. However, there is one interesting point of difference. Research into an Aboriginal concept (eg. Kearins, 1983 & Malin, 1990 cited in Gibson & Vialle, 2007) consistently identifies independence, self-reliance and autonomy as valued characteristics. For Māori (and arguably for Navajo) interdependence is more highly valued.

Two further points of similarity between Māori, Navajo and Aboriginal views of giftedness relate to the inclusion of naturalist and spiritual components of giftedness. While these two areas are included in some western, multicategorical conceptions of giftedness, there are relatively few examples of associated provisions in the gifted literature and the existence of spiritual giftedness remains a controversial issue (Piechowski, 2003).

Providing for gifted students from minority cultures

Before considering the educational implications of varying cultural concepts of giftedness, it is pertinent to ask: Exactly how well are gifted students from minority cultures being provided for in our schools? A comprehensive review of international and New Zealand literature relating to gifted education for students from minority cultural groups (Riley, Bevan-Brown, Bicknell, Carroll-Lind & Kearney, 2004a) revealed that, with a few exceptions, gifted and talented minority students are considerably under-represented in gifted education. This under-representation was reported for minority cultures in general (Bernal, 2003; Fletcher & Massalski, 2003; Mills & Tissot, 1995; Sisk, 2003; Worrell, Szarko & Gabelko, 2001) and for particular ethnic groups, namely:

⁵ Gardner has still not accepted spirituality as a full intelligence however it has since received support from a number of eminent academics and researchers and has a "demonstrated neurological basis" (Piechowski, 2003, p. 413). It should also be acknowledged that Gardner's naturalistic intelligence extends beyond connection to the land. It has a strong focus on discerning patterns and differences in natural objects.

- Native Hawaiian (Martin, Sing & Hunter, 2003);
- African-American (Ford, Harris III, Tyson & Trotman, 2002);
- Hispanic (Ford, 1998);
- Australian Aborigine and Torres Strait Islanders (Gibson & Vialle, 2007; Harslett, 1993; Vasilevska, 2003);
- Pacific Island and Arab-speaking students in New South Wales (Vasilevska, 2003).

In New Zealand there are both anecdotal reports of the under-representation of Māori in gifted education (Bevan-Brown, 1993, 2002; Cathcart & Pou, 1992; Galu, 1998; Moltzen, 1998/1999; Reid, 1992) and empirical evidence of such (Keen, 2001, 2002). In respect to gifted Navajo students, while Begay and Maker (2007) do not specifically mention their under-representation in gifted education, they do state that these students are not adequately provided for in conventional schools.

Causes of under-representation

Numerous causes have been given for this under-representation of gifted minority students. In the main they are related to discriminatory assessment practices such as culturally biased assessment measures and narrow selection criteria. Table 2 summarises problems identified in the literature in relation to the identification of culturally diverse students.

Table 2. Problems Associated with the Identification of Culturally Diverse Students

| |
|--|
| 1. Low teacher expectation |
| 2. Teacher bias |
| 3. Low teacher referral rate |
| 4. Inadequate teacher preparation in testing, assessment, multicultural and gifted education |
| 5. Cross-cultural misinterpretations and misunderstandings |
| 6. Inadequate home-school communication about gifted education opportunities |
| 7. Narrow concepts of giftedness |
| 8. Negative stereotyping of minority group students |
| 9. Characteristics associated with cultural diversity that may obscure giftedness |
| 10. Reluctance amongst parents of students from diverse minority cultures to identify their children as gifted and nominate them for gifted programmes |
| 11. Students unmotivated to perform in test situations |
| 12. Students inhibited by conditions of poverty or psychological stress |
| 13. Geographic isolation |
| 14. The pervasive deficit orientation in society and educational institutions |

(Riley et al, 2004b, p. 25)

A number of these problems relate directly or indirectly to differing conceptions of giftedness. The most obvious is 'narrow concepts of giftedness.' In New Zealand, despite most schools having a multicategorical definition, a national questionnaire completed by 48% of all schools showed that cultural, spiritual and emotional giftedness were often overlooked and that "many of the reported definitions, identification practices, and provisions did not embody Māori perspectives and values" (Riley et al, 2004b, p. 3).

Similarly, Gibson and Vialle (2007) describe a number of research studies concerning Aboriginal students which show "the fallibility of using narrow conceptions of giftedness and correspondingly limited tools for identification such as IQ tests" (p. 219). While Begay and Maker (2007) also note that no provision for incorporating Dine' traditional conceptions of giftedness is made in either English American or federally funded 'self-determination' grant schools.

Incorporating differing cultural concepts of giftedness

In order to provide effectively for gifted minority students, differing cultural concepts of giftedness need to be acknowledged, valued and provided for, but how can this be achieved? An important first step is to address the 'inadequate teacher preparation in testing, assessment, multicultural and gifted education' listed in Table 2. All pre-service and in-service teacher education should include information about diverse cultures and diverse cultural concepts of giftedness (Ford, 2003). After all, if teachers do not understand the Māori concept of 'mana tangata' how can they recognise it in their pupils? Similarly, if they are unaware of the Navajo obligation to use one's gifts to help others or the Aboriginal emphasis on spatial intelligence, will they provide educational programs that incorporate these components?

A second step is for teachers to provide culturally responsive school environments. These are environments where diverse cultures and values are acknowledged and celebrated, where the content and context of learning are relevant for all students and where a wide range of assessment and teaching approaches is utilised. In a supportive learning environment which reflects and values cultural diversity, gifted minority students will feel 'safe' to reveal their gifts and talents (Banks & McGee-Banks, 2006; Bishop & Glynn, 1999; Ford, 2003). For Māori, the concept of giftedness is holistic and intertwined with other Māori attitudes, beliefs, needs, values, customs and concepts, so encouraging and developing students in their Māori culture goes hand in hand with developing their giftedness. A similar situation is expressed by Gibson and Vialle (2007) in respect to Aboriginal students:

We suspect that many Aboriginal children fail to realize their gifted potential because they are unable to find that harmony with their identity. The challenge for educators, then, is to help Aboriginal children in negotiating the process of developing self-confidence and a strong sense of identity. (p. 221)

What would a culturally responsive environment look like for gifted Māori, Navajo and Aboriginal students? The physical environment would incorporate culturally

meaningful icons; culturally appropriate measures and processes would be used to identify their areas of giftedness; and, once identified, these students would be provided with extension programs and activities that incorporated relevant cultural content, processes, values, and accommodated preferred learning styles. For example, a group of Māori students gifted in science might investigate together the chemical properties of Māori food and rongoā (medicine); a Navajo student might research traditional astronomical knowledge and consider its contemporary application (Begay, Maryboy & Sakimoto, 2008) including ways this knowledge might benefit their own community; and an Aboriginal student might compare and contrast the Dreamtime stories of various Aboriginal nations or trace the linguistic evolution of different Aboriginal dialects noting their similarities and differences.

Given the importance of interpersonal and intrapersonal skills and abilities to Māori, Navajo and Australian Aborigine groups, a culturally responsive environment would include many learning opportunities in these domains. It is acknowledged that in some particular areas this will present a challenge for teachers: How does one foster bravery, sensitivity to others or spirituality? In respect to the latter, some may ask whether this is, in fact, an area that teachers should address. While certain components of spirituality are not appropriate for the classroom and should be left to parents, families and certain members of the cultural community to foster and develop, other more general aspects can be included in the classroom program. For example, for Māori students, Bevan-Brown (2009) suggests studies of Māori spiritual leaders, analysis of the specific roles of traditional atua (gods), and journaling and creative writing to develop reflective thinking and nurture emotional and spiritual intelligence. An excellent example is provided by Fraser (2002) in her work with gifted and mixed ability students. After exploring metaphorical expressions taken from literature, the students chose a particular human emotion or quality to write about as if it were a real person. This activity provides gifted students with the opportunity to reveal mature moral awareness and spiritual sensitivity, to develop personal insights and to deepen interpersonal and intrapersonal understandings. Further noteworthy approaches are discussed by Sisk (2008) in an article on "Engaging the spiritual intelligence of gifted students to build global awareness in the classroom."

A third step towards the inclusion of diverse cultural concepts of giftedness is the greater involvement of parents, families and the community (Ford, 2003; Gallagher, 2003). In her research, Bevan-Brown (1993) found the development and utilisation of strong school-family-community networks an important means of supporting and encouraging gifted Māori children. It is likely that such networks would also benefit gifted Navajo and Aboriginal students. Parents and family members are the experts on their respective cultural concepts of giftedness and so can assist teachers to identify gifted children and incorporate cultural concepts into educational programs. They can also be involved as resource people, advisors, volunteers, audiences, mentors, role models, and program evaluators. In fact, parents, family and community members can be consulted and included in all relevant decision-making pertaining to their gifted children.

A win-win situation

The previously discussed steps for incorporating differing cultural concepts of giftedness will not only benefit gifted education but also education in general. This contention has literature support — researchers and educationalists acclaim the advantages of: teachers being better trained to teach in multicultural schools (Banks, 2006; Banks & McGee-Banks, 2006); learning environments and approaches that reflect, cater for and value cultural diversity (Bishop & Glynn, 1999; Gay, 2000); and the involvement of ethnic minority parents, families and communities in the education of their children (Howland, Anderson, Smiley & Abbott, 2006; Muscott, 2002).

In addition, teachers would do well to consider what indigenous beliefs can contribute to both gifted and general education. The importance Māori, Navajo and Australian Aborigines place on interpersonal, intrapersonal and spiritual qualities, for example, could prove beneficial in a world where racial and religious conflict is rife. Certainly, programs that seek to identify and nurture potential Nelson Mandelas and Mother Therasas would be welcomed internationally. Similarly, the indigenous emphasis on respecting nature and identifying and nurturing students with outstanding naturalist intelligence could contribute to solving problems such as global warming and food shortages in developing countries.

Conclusion

In gifted education one size does not fit all. Diversity exists across a range of dimensions including the very nature of giftedness itself. While this diversity is complex and complicating, it is an asset and needs to be recognised, provided for and valued. In doing so, teachers will not only be catering for gifted students from minority cultures but they will also be providing a model for accommodating alternative perspectives that can be used in all multicultural educational contexts to benefit all students regardless of their ability level.

Research cited previously shows that, internationally, students from minority cultures are under-represented in gifted programs and that a wide variety of causes contribute to this situation. The following questionnaire⁶ is offered to help teachers assess the extent and quality of their own school's provisions for gifted students from minority cultures. Its purpose is to identify changes needed to enable these students to have their gifts and talents recognised, affirmed and developed. Hopefully, use of this questionnaire will play a small part in eliminating the under-representation of gifted minority group students.

⁶ This questionnaire has not been field tested as yet. The writer would appreciate receiving feedback from any person who uses it.

**How well is your school providing for gifted students from minority cultures?
Twenty-five questions for you to consider.**

Demographics

1. What is the cultural composition of the students in your school? (Give percentage of overall school population for each cultural group)
2. Does your school have a gifted register and/or programme?
3. If so, what is the ethnicity of the students identified/involved?
4. Do the numbers from each cultural group reflect their proportion within the whole school?
5. If not, which groups are over or under-represented and why is this so?

Concept

6. What are the conceptions of giftedness of the various cultural groups represented in your school?
7. What is your school's definition of giftedness?
8. Does this definition include the essential elements of the cultural conceptions described in question 6?
9. If not, what elements need to be added?

Identification

10. What methods and measures are used to identify gifted students in your school?
11. Do these include a variety of culturally appropriate approaches that ensure gifted minority students are not overlooked?
12. Are students identified in areas that are highly valued by their cultural group including cultural skills and abilities?
13. Is both gifted performance and gifted potential identified?
14. Are parents, family and community members involved in a culturally appropriate way in identifying gifted students?

Provisions

15. What areas of giftedness are recognised and provided for in your school?
16. Do they take into account differing cultural perspectives, interpretations, values, behaviours and practices?
17. Do they include the arts, crafts, music, skills, traditions, knowledge and languages of minority cultures?
18. Do they include abilities and qualities that are highly valued by minority cultures?
19. Are parents, family and community members: Consulted about gifted provisions; involved in decision-making relating to these provisions and to their children's participation in them; invited to contribute their expertise and involved in the evaluation of these provisions?

General

20. In what ways does your school provide a culturally responsive, supportive learning environment which reflects and values cultural diversity?
21. Does the identification and fostering of giftedness in minority culture areas and from multicultural perspectives receive the same priority, status, funding and time commitment as majority culture input?
22. Are teachers adequately trained to provide for gifted students from all cultures?

23. If not, what in-service education is offered to up-skill and update teachers in respect to testing, assessment, multicultural and gifted education?
24. Does your school have equity measures to ensure gifted students do not miss out on extension opportunities because of socio-economic factors?
25. Do gifted students from minority groups have access to role models/mentors (real or virtual) from their own culture?

References

- Banks, J.A. (2006). *Diversity in American education: Foundations, curriculum and teaching*. Boston: Allyn & Bacon.
- Banks, J.A. & McGee-Banks, C. A. (Eds.)(2006). *Multicultural education. Issues and perspectives* (6th ed.). Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.
- Barlow, C. (1991). *Tikanga whakaaro. Key concepts in Maori culture*. Auckland: Oxford University Press.
- Begay, D., Maryboy, N, & Sakimoto, P. (2008). *The coyote and the astrophysicist: Learning to teach together*. Paper presented at the World Indigenous People's Conference on Education, December, 2008, Melbourne, Australia.
- Begay, H. & Maker, C.J. (2007). When geniuses fail: Na-Dene' (Navajo) conception of giftedness in the eyes of the holy deities. In S.N. Phillipson & M. McCann (Eds.), *Conceptions of giftedness. Sociocultural perspectives* (pp. 127-168). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Bernal, E. M. (2003). Delivering two-way bilingual immersion programs to the gifted and talented: A classic yet progressive option for the millennium. In J. F. Smutny (Ed.), *Underserved gifted populations. Responding to their needs and abilities* (pp. 139-140). Cresskill, NJ: Hampton Press, Inc.
- Bevan-Brown, J. (1993). *Special abilities: A Māori perspective*. Unpublished master's thesis, Massey University, Palmerston North.
- Bevan-Brown, J. (2002). *Culturally appropriate, effective provision for Māori learners with special needs: He waka tino whakarawea*. Unpublished doctoral thesis, Massey University, Palmerston North.
- Bevan-Brown, J. (2004). Gifted and talented Māori learners. In D. McAlpine & R. Moltzen (Eds.), *Gifted and talented: New Zealand perspectives* (pp.171-198). Palmerston North: Kanuka Grove Press.
- Bevan-Brown, J. (2009). Identifying and providing for gifted and talented Māori students. *APEX*, 15(4), 6-20.
- Bishop, R. & Glynn, T. (1999). *Culture counts: Changing power relations in education*. Palmerston North: Dunmore Press.
- Cathcart, R. & Pou, N. (1992). The gifted child who is Māori. *NZAGC Gifted Children Their Future: Our Challenge*, 17 (3), 13-17.
- Colangelo, N. & Davis, G.A. (2003). *Handbook of gifted education* (3rd ed.). Boston, MA: Allyn and Bacon.
- Doidge, G. (1990). Māori children, Māori studies: A special giftedness. *APEX*, 4 (2), 36-39.
- Fletcher, T. V., & Massalski D. C. (2003). Poised on the threshold of a new paradigm for giftedness: Children from culturally and linguistically diverse backgrounds. In J. F. Smutny (Ed.), *Underserved gifted populations. Responding to their needs and abilities* (pp. 157-178). Cresskill, NJ: Hampton Press, Inc.
- Ford, D. Y. (1998). The under-representation of minority students in gifted education: Problems and promises. *Journal of Special Education*, 32 (1), 4 -14.
- Ford, D.Y. (2003). Equity and Excellence: Culturally diverse students in gifted education. In N. Colangelo & G.A. Davis (Eds.), *Handbook of gifted education* (3rd ed.) (pp. 506-520). Boston, MA: Allyn and Bacon.
- Ford, D. Y., Harris III, J. J., Tyson, C. A. & Trotman, M. F. (2002). Beyond deficit thinking: Providing access for gifted African American students. *Roeper Review*, 24(2), 52-58.

- Fraser, D. (2002). *Emotional knowing through creative writing*. Paper presented at the 10th International Conference on Thinking, June, 2002, Harrogate, UK.
- Gagné, F. (2003). Transforming gifts into talents: The DMGT as a developmental theory. In N. Colangelo & G.A. Davis (Eds.), *Handbook of gifted education* (3rd ed.) (pp. 60-74). Boston, MA: Allyn and Bacon.
- Gallagher, J.J. (2003). Issues and challenges in the education of gifted students. In N. Colangelo & G.A. Davis (Eds.), *Handbook of gifted education*. (3rd ed.) (pp. 11-23). Boston, MA: Allyn and Bacon.
- Galu, M. (1998). *Gifted and talented perceptions of Māori and Polynesian students educated in segregated classes*. Unpublished master's thesis. University of Waikato, Hamilton.
- Gardner, H. (1983). *Frames of mind: The theory of Multiple Intelligences*. New York: Basic Books.
- Gay, G. (2000). *Culturally responsive teaching: Theory, research, and practice*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Gibson, K. & Vialle, W. (2007). The Australian Aboriginal view of giftedness. In S.N. Phillipson & M. McCann (Eds.), *Conceptions of giftedness. Sociocultural perspectives* (pp. 169-196). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Harslett, M. G. (1993). *The identification of gifted Aboriginal children*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. University of Western Australia, Perth.
- Howland, A., Anderson, J.A., Smiley, A.D., & Abbott, D. (2006). School liaisons: Bridging the gap between home and school. *School Community Journal*, 16(2), 47-68.
- Keen, D. (2001). *Talent in the New Millennium. Research Study, 2001-2002, into gifted education in the Bay of Plenty, Otago and Southland regions of New Zealand*. Paper presented at the AARE conference, Fremantle, Australia.
- Keen, D. (2002). *Talent in the New Millennium. Bay of Plenty-Otago-Southland regional research study into gifted education*. Progress Report on phase 4 of the project: Outcomes of the April-May 2002 regional workshops.
- Marsden, M. (1992). God, man and universe: A Māori view. In M. King (Ed.), *Te ao hurihuri. Aspects of Māoritanga* (pp. 118-138). Auckland: Reed Books.
- Martin, D. E., Sing, D. K. & Hunter, L. A. (2003). Na pua no 'eau: The Hawaiian perspective of giftedness. In J. F. Smutny (Ed.), *Underserved gifted populations. Responding to their needs and abilities* (pp.179-204). Cresskill, NJ: Hampton Press, Inc.
- McAlpine, D. (1991). Issues in the education of the gifted and talented. In *Proceedings for the 1991 NZAGC Teachers' Conference 'Education for the Gifted and Talented Child'*, pp.12-19. Auckland: NZAGC.
- Mead, H.M. (2003). *Tikanga Maori. Living by Maori values*. Wellington: Huia Publishers.
- Mills, C. J. & Tissot, S. L. (1995). Identifying academic potential in students from under-represented populations: Is using the Raven's Progressive Matrices a good idea? *Gifted Child Quarterly*, 39(4), 209-217.
- Moltzen, R. (1998/1999). Young, gifted and living in New Zealand. *APEX*, 11/12 (1), 57-68.
- Muscott, H.S. (2002). Exceptional partnerships: Listening to the voices of families. *Preventing School Failure*, 46(2), 66-9.
- Piechowski, M. M. (2003). Emotional and spiritual giftedness. In N. Colangelo & G.A. Davis (Eds.), *Handbook of gifted education*. (3rd ed.) (pp 403-423). Boston, MA: Allyn and Bacon.
- Pere, R.R. Ako. (1982). *Concepts and learning in the Māori tradition. Working Paper No.17*. Hamilton: University of Waikato.
- Phillipson, S. N. (2007). Preface. In S.N. Phillipson & M. McCann (Eds.), *Conceptions of giftedness. Sociocultural perspectives* (pp. ix-xiv). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Reid, N. (1992). Correcting cultural myopia. In E. Le Sueur (Ed.), *Proceedings of the Guiding the Gifted Conference*, July 6-7th (pp. 49-63). Auckland: Conference Publishing Limited.
- Riley, T., Bevan-Brown, J., Bicknell, B., Carroll-Lind, J. & Kearney, A. (2004a). *The extent, nature and effectiveness of planned approaches in New Zealand schools for providing for gifted and talented students*. Report to the Ministry of Education. Palmerston North:

- Massey University, IPDER.
- Riley, T., Bevan-Brown, J., Bicknell, B., Carroll-Lind, J. & Kearney, A. (2004b). *Gifted and talented education in New Zealand schools*. Wellington, New Zealand: Ministry of Education.
- Sisk, D. (2003). Maximizing the high potential of minority economically disadvantaged students. In J. F. Smutny (Ed.), *Underserved gifted populations. Responding to their needs and abilities* (pp.239-260). Cresskill, NJ: Hampton Press, Inc.
- Sisk, D. (2008). Engaging the spiritual intelligence of gifted students to build global awareness in the classroom. *Roeper Review*, 30, 24-30.
- Sternberg, R.J. (1985). *Beyond IQ: A triarchic theory of human intelligence*. Cambridge, MA: Cambridge University Press.
- Sternberg, R.J. (2007). Forward. In S.N. Phillipson & M. McCann (Eds.), *Conceptions of giftedness. Sociocultural perspectives* (pp. xv-xviii). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Vasilevska, S. (2003). *Cultural conceptions of giftedness: Examining the myths*. Paper presented at the 15th World Conference on Gifted, Adelaide, August 1-5.
- Worrell, F. C., Szarko, J.E., & Gabelko, N. H. (2001). Multi-Year persistence of non-traditional students in an academic talent development program. *Journal of Secondary Gifted Education*, 12(2), 80-89.