
Teachers' Knowledge of Gifted Learning Disabled Students in NSW

Catherine Wormald
University of Wollongong, Australia

Abstract

Little or no empirical research on gifted learning disabled students has been conducted in Australia. This research investigated the knowledge teachers in New South Wales, Australia had of these students. A mixed methods approach was adopted involving surveys and interviews of teachers from primary and secondary schools across all education sectors. The study focused on two issues: the teachers' knowledge of, and attitudes towards, these students; and, the educational programs they implemented for these students. Demographics from the survey highlighted the lack of postgraduate training by teachers in both gifted education and learning disabilities. The findings showed that schools are not able to identify these students and are not meeting their specific educational needs. The evidence suggested that schools exhibited inconsistent knowledge about these students, and demonstrated a lack of understanding of how these students are affected by what the teachers do in the classroom. For ease of reading, the abbreviation GLD is used instead of the phrase gifted with a learning disability.

Introduction

Gifted education in Australia has made considerable progress but there exists a subgroup of gifted students who have been overlooked. Students who are both gifted and have a learning disability present a paradox to the education community. GLD students are often not identified in either category as their giftedness may mask the disability and/or the student may be achieving at an appropriate grade for age level. On the other hand, the student's disability may be identified rather than the giftedness (Little, 2001).

Gifted students with a learning disability

One of the possible reasons for the lack of recognition of this population by teachers is the difficulty in defining it. Many definitions exist for both giftedness and learning disabilities but each is defined by the educational professionals involved with the individual groups. Professionals working with each group have failed to agree on a universal definition that recognises GLD students. Defining a student who is GLD would require elements from the definitions of both a gifted student, and a student

with learning disabilities. This would mean that a gifted student who has a learning disability may be defined as a student with natural abilities in the intellectual, creative, socioaffective or sensorimotor domains (Gagné's Differentiated Model of Giftedness and Talent [DMGT]), and yet at the same time have impairment in processes that are related to learning, thinking, remembering, or perceiving.

Baum, Owen and Dixon (1991) identified three subgroups of GLD students. The first group is students identified as gifted who have subtle learning difficulties, which become apparent as the level of work undertaken at school increases in difficulty. The second group is those who are not identified as gifted or having a learning disability, as they are achieving at a grade level. The third group is the students who are identified for their learning disability and are often placed in remedial programs.

The characteristics of a GLD student have been well documented and researched (Barton & Starnes, 1989; Baum & Owen, 1988; Brody & Mills, 1997; Hishinuma & Tadaki, 1998; Munro, 2002). Case study research has shown that GLD students demonstrated many of the characteristics of their gifted peers, but they were also recognised as a heterogeneous group with their own unique characteristics (Barton & Starnes, 1989; Baum, Emerick, & Herman, 1989; Yewchuk, 1983).

Over a period of time, GLD education has received increased attention in the area of developing and providing appropriate educational programming for these students (Baum, 1988; Bees, 1998; Hishinuma & Nishimura, 2000; Shevitz, Weinfeld, Jeweler, & Barnes-Robinson, 2003; Weinfeld, Barnes-Robinson, Jeweler, & Shevita, 2002), in addition to integration and teaching strategies (Baum, Cooper & Neu, 2001; Bisland, 2004). Successful programs for GLD students are programs that recognise a student's giftedness while at the same time recognising that they have learning disabilities and providing assistance in the development of strategies to overcome their learning disabilities (Barton & Starnes, 1989; Baum & Owen, 1988; Baum, Cooper & Neu, 2001; Bisland, 2004; Brody & Mills, 1997; Hishinuma & Tadaki, 1998; Munro, 2002).

Research Method

A mixed methods approach was used in this research in order to gain greater insight and understanding of teachers' and school counsellors' knowledge of, and attitudes to GLD students. Teachers and school counsellors were surveyed and subsequently interviewed. Teachers and school counsellors were surveyed using the Survey of Practices with Students of Varying Needs (SOP). Following analysis of the surveys, a small number of teachers were interviewed.

Participants

Staff at eleven schools participated in the research. The schools were selected from schools within a metropolitan New South Wales Department of Education and Training (NSW DET) School Education Area and included selective high schools, a school with opportunity classes in addition to mainstream classes, comprehensive high schools and mainstream primary schools. Students in selective high schools and opportunity classes have been identified as gifted and have gained entry through a

combination of testing and school grades. Comprehensive high schools and mainstream primary schools from Sydney's Catholic Education Office (CEO) and one independent Kindergarten to Year 12 school also participated in the research.

Eight teachers and school counsellors were interviewed after collection of the surveys. The interviewees represented a cross-section of teachers across all education systems (government, Catholic, independent), school types (primary and secondary schools, selective schools) and included a gender balance.

Instrument

The SOP was used to assess teachers' knowledge of, and attitude to, gifted and learning disabled students (Tomlinson, Callahan, Moon, Tomchin, Landrum, Imbeau, Hunsaker & Eiss, 1995). It also provided an indication of teachers' confidence at meeting these students' educational needs and the different strategies they could implement in order to do so.

The SOP consisted of four parts. Part I addressed the knowledge and attitudes of teachers towards gifted learners and struggling learners. In Part II of the SOP, teachers were asked to reflect and rank, from one to three, the amount of time and attention they gave to the groups of average, learning disabled and gifted students respectively.

Part III asked respondents to rate on a scale, ranging from no confidence to very confident, their ability to:

- adapt their lessons to meet the needs of gifted and remedial learners;
- accommodate varying levels of ability in their class;
- assess where students were and designing appropriate lessons;
- individualise instruction to meet the needs of gifted and remedial learners;
- and,
- identify gifted and remedial students.

In Part IV, respondents were asked to nominate which of 14 specific techniques, activities or instructional strategies they thought they would use in the classroom with average, gifted and special education students.

Data analysis

For the demographics, the frequencies and percentages of participants' responses were calculated for the variables of: age; whether the school had provisions for gifted students or learning disabled students; whether the respondent had responsibility for gifted students or learning disabled students; and whether formal study had been completed by the teacher in gifted or special education. Data for gifted and learning disabled provisions, responsibility for gifted or learning disabled students and formal study in the field of gifted or special education were separated into two groups – one including, and another excluding selective high schools.

Each of the four parts of the survey were analysed separately. A gifted subscale and a learning disability subscale were formed from the 35 items in Part I. Means and standard deviations for each item in the two sub-scales were calculated. A two-way

between-groups analysis of variance (ANOVA) was conducted to explore the impact, if any, that the age of the teachers and their work environment – selective high schools versus mainstream schools — had on teachers' and school counsellors' knowledge of, and attitudes to, gifted students and students with learning disabilities. A one-way ANOVA was conducted to compare the gifted sub-scale scores for teachers who had formal training in gifted education and teachers who had no formal training in gifted education. Similarly a one-way ANOVA was conducted to compare the effect of having formal training in learning disabilities. Percentage rankings were calculated for Part II of the survey, means and standard deviations for Part III and percentages and rankings for Part IV.

Results

One subject in gifted education had been studied at the undergraduate level by 9.2% of teachers. This is in direct contrast to undergraduate study in learning disabilities, where 20.6% of teachers had studied a subject related to learning difficulties in their undergraduate degree. Two teachers had undertaken a gifted subject, and one teacher a learning disabilities subject in their Master of Special Education degree. The majority of teachers, including those from selective high schools, had no formal training in either gifted education or learning disabilities.

When excluding selective high school data, the full-time provision in mainstream and comprehensive schools for gifted students was half that for students with learning disabilities. In mainstream and comprehensive schools, the main provision for gifted students was part-time provision, enrichment, and extension work or withdrawal programs.

Teachers were asked to indicate whether they held a position of responsibility for gifted or learning disabled students. When eliminating selective high school responses, the most common response was that the participants had no responsibility for gifted or learning disabled students.

A greater number of teachers, when including selective high school data, had no training in gifted education than when selective high schools data are excluded. This pattern also held true for qualifications in learning disabilities. Additionally, a greater percentage of non-selective high school teachers have postgraduate qualifications or additional training in gifted education. Teachers teaching in a specialist high school for gifted students had fewer qualifications than those who were not teaching in a selective high school. This is a real concern as the expectation would be that as selective high schools are specialist schools educating students who have been identified as gifted, the teachers should have a greater rate of training in gifted education.

A one-way ANOVA was conducted to compare the gifted scale scores for teachers who had formal training in gifted education and teachers who had no formal training in gifted education. There was a significant difference in scores for teachers who had formal training in gifted education as compared to teachers who had no formal training in gifted education ($F=8.150$, $p < .005$). Similarly a one-way ANOVA was

conducted to compare the effect of formal training in learning disabilities. No significant effect was found for teachers who were trained in learning difficulties.

The data demonstrated that a greater percentage of schools do not have full-time gifted provisions but rather provide for these students on a part-time basis and by implementing enrichment, extension and withdrawal programs. Additionally, when selective high school data are excluded, most schools do not have a person responsible for either gifted provisions or learning disabilities.

From Part I of the SOP a gifted learner's and a struggling learner's subscale were formed. These subscales assessed knowledge and attitudes of teachers and school counsellors towards gifted and learning disabled. Analysis of results showed that teachers' knowledge of, and attitudes to, gifted learners were positive and demonstrated that they had some awareness of gifted education. In contrast, teachers' attitudes to struggling learners were ambivalent.

In Part II of the SOP, teachers were asked to rank from one to three the amount of time and attention they gave to the groups of learning disabled, average and gifted students with one being the greatest amount of time and attention, and three the least amount of time. Teachers responded in the following ways:

- 39.4% ranked average students as number one;
- 32.8% ranked special education students as number one;
- 8.6% ranked gifted as number one; and,
- 22.9% stated they spent an equal amount of time with each group.

These results demonstrated that the greatest percentage of teachers is teaching to the middle and lower levels of the class. Excluding selective high school data decreased the percentage of teachers who ranked gifted students at number one and increased the number who ranked them at number three.

In Part III response options ranged from 1 (no confidence) to 5 (most confident). Teachers' responses indicated that they felt some confidence about accommodating various levels of ability, assessing where students are at, designing appropriate lessons, identifying remedial learners and adapting lessons to meet the needs of gifted learners. For the remaining items, teachers did not express strong feelings either way. These results conflicted with the results for Part I of the survey. Teachers had a positive attitude towards gifted students yet they did not feel confident at individualising instruction or even identifying gifted students. Teachers' ranking of confidence levels with respect to remedial learners is in line with their ambivalent attitude towards these students except with respect to identifying these students with which they have indicated some confidence. These results represented substantial conflict with teachers noting that they accommodated various levels of students in their classroom yet they were not confident in individualising instruction for gifted and remedial students.

In Part IV, respondents were asked to nominate which of 14 specific techniques, activities or instructional strategies they would consider using in the classroom with gifted, average and special education students.

The three most common strategies teachers reported that they would consider using for gifted students were higher level thinking practices (65.7%), independent study (61.9%) and curriculum compacting (46.3%). Two of these strategies were also ranked in the three most common strategies that teachers would consider using with average students, that is, higher level thinking practices (42.8%) and independent studies (30.6%). The third most common strategy considered for average students was drill and practice (40.5%). Drill and practice (49.7%) was the number one strategy that teachers would consider for special education students. Individual instruction (25.2%) and workbook exercises (10.7%) were the additional common strategies that teachers would consider using with special education students.

The strategies of independent study, interdisciplinary activities, problem solving activities and projects are strategies teachers would not consider using with special education students. Whilst other listed strategies ranked low as possibilities for use with gifted and average students, there was not a single strategy that they would not consider using at all.

It is interesting to note that some of the activities teachers considered appropriate for gifted students are not considered for special education students or are considered by only a few teachers. Rogers (2002) suggested that there are strategies appropriate for all students, including gifted students. These may include drill and practice, higher order thinking practices, individual projects, curriculum compacting, individual instruction and problem solving activities. Drill and practice was ranked number one for special education students, but 14th for gifted students with only 4.6% of teachers considering this strategy for gifted students. Despite ability grouping being ranked 4th for special education students, only 8.4% considered it, yet 31.2% of teachers ranked it 5th for gifted students. This strategy would be appropriate for all students, and would provide opportunity for like-minded students to work together cooperatively – a strategy ranked 9th (16%) and 5th (20.6%) respectively for gifted and average students and 7th (3.8%) for special education students.

Discussion

Identification of students who are gifted with a learning disability as demonstrated by this research is possibly not occurring in schools, not because the teachers are unwilling or unsupportive of the concept, but rather because they do not have the ability, knowledge and support to do so. They were interested to learn more in order to provide appropriate educational experiences for this group of students and felt that with the support and cooperation of the staff involved that this could be achieved.

Some of the data obtained from the surveys in addition to data from the interviews confirmed that teachers can identify gifted students and that they are aware of the classroom strategies that are relevant for these students. This was demonstrated by the positive attitudes teachers had towards gifted students and their ability to articulate the characteristics of gifted students. The teachers interviewed were also

able to discuss various appropriate classroom strategies such as open-ended tasks and curriculum differentiation.

Data demonstrated substantial confusion, however, with teachers noting that they have knowledge of gifted education, yet do not rate themselves as confident at identifying gifted students and providing appropriate lessons and instruction. The survey data and interview data also indicated that teachers are aware of the appropriate strategies and activities for these students yet when asked to provide specific examples of tasks or programming for gifted students they were unable to do so.

A contradiction was also established with respect to students with learning disabilities. The survey data demonstrated that teachers had some confidence in identifying these students but interviewing showed that this was probably because the teachers considered that the students were being identified prior to attending class. Additionally the interviewees did not feel it was their responsibility to meet these students' needs in the classroom. This was demonstrated through their inability to provide examples of specific disabilities that they would recognise in their classrooms and strategies for these students that they would implement in their classes.

These issues highlighted that identifying gifted students with a learning disability in the school system is unlikely to occur, particularly when there is a definite and visible divide between students with learning disabilities and students who are gifted. This was highlighted by not only the different attitudes of the teachers as demonstrated through analysis of the surveys but also the contradictions provided through survey data analysis and analysis of teacher interviews. Substantial, appropriate and comprehensive training is needed in order to overcome these deficits.

In order to provide an educational program that is appropriate for these students, teachers need to have sound knowledge and understanding of the special educational needs of this population of students. Through an understanding of these students, teachers will have an awareness of whether the strategies that they are using in the classroom are appropriate. If the strategies are not appropriate, teachers will need to learn what is required in order to be able to implement the correct strategies and activities for diverse learners. The contradictions, conflicts and confusion that have been demonstrated throughout the research highlighted that teachers do not have the ability to effectively meet the needs of diverse learners.

References

- Barton, J.M., & Starnes, W.T. (1989). Identifying distinguishing characteristics of gifted and talented learning disabled students. *Roeper Review*, 12(1), 23-29.
- Baum, S. (1988). An enrichment program for gifted learning disabled students. *Gifted Child Quarterly*, 32(1), 226-230.
- Baum, S., Cooper, C.R., & Neu, T.W. (2001). Dual differentiation: An approach for meeting the curricular needs of gifted students with learning disabilities. *Psychology in the Schools*, 38(5), 477-490.
- Baum, S.L., Emerick, J., & Herman, G.N., & Dixon, J. (1989). Identification programs and enrichment strategies for gifted learning disabled youth. *Roeper Review*, 12(1), 49-53.

- Baum, S., & Owen, S.V. (1988). High ability learning disabled students: How are they different? *Gifted Child Quarterly*, 32(3), 321-326.
- Baum, S., Owen, S.V. & Dixon, J. (1991). *To be gifted and learning disabled: From identification to practical intervention strategies*. Melbourne, VIC: Hawker Brownlow Education.
- Bees, C. (1998). The GOLD program: A program for gifted learning disabled adolescents. *Roeper Review*, 21(2), 155-161.
- Bisland, A. (2004). Using learning-strategies instruction with students who are gifted and learning disabled. *Gifted Child Today*, 27(3), 52-58.
- Brody, L.E., & Mills, C.J. (1997). Gifted children with learning disabilities: A review of the issues. *Journal of Learning Disabilities*, 30(3), 282-296.
- Hishinuma, E.S., & Nishimura, S.T. (2000). Parent attitudes on the importance and success of integrated self-contained services for students who are gifted, learning disabled, and gifted/learning disabled. *Roeper Review*, 22(4), 241-250.
- Hishinuma, E.S., & Tadaki, S. (1998). Addressing diversity of the gifted at risk. *Our Gifted Children*, 4(5), 20-23.
- Little, C. (2001). A closer look at gifted children with disabilities. *Gifted Child Today*, 24(3), 46-64.
- Munro, J. (2002). Understanding and identifying gifted learning disabled students. *Australian Journal of Learning Disabilities*, 7(2), 20-31.
- Shevitz, B., Weinfeld, R., Jeweler, S., & Barnes-Robinson, L. (2003). Mentoring empowers gifted/learning disabled students to soar. *Roeper Review*, 26(1), 37-40.
- Tomlinson, C.A., Callahan, C.M., Moon, T.R., Tomchin, E.M., Landrum, M., Imbeau, M., Hunsaker, S.L., & Eiss, N. (1995) *Preservice teacher preparation in meeting the needs of gifted and other academically diverse students*. Research monograph 95134. The University of Virginia. Charlottesville, VA.
- Weinfeld, R.B., Barnes-Robinson, L., Jeweler, S., & Shevitz, B. (2002). Academic programs for gifted and talented/learning disabled students. *Roeper Review*, 24(4), 226-233.
- Yewchuk, C. (1983). Learning disabled/gifted children: Characteristic features. *The Mental and Retardation and Learning Disability*, 11, 128-133.