JOURNAL OF EDUCATIONAL SCIENCES THEORY AND PRACTICE Vol. 16, No 2, 2021

Received: 31,10.2021.
DOI: 10.46763/JESPT21162070a
UDC: 373.3.011.3-051:159.928.22-057.874
Revised: 05.12, 2021.
Accepted: 08.12.2021

THE ROLE OF THE TEACHER IN IDENTIFYING THE TALENTED AND GIFTED CHILDREN

Yrmet Shabani[1]
Tatjana Atanasoska[2]

[1]yrmet77@hotmail.com
[2] Faculty of Pedagogy Bitola University St. Kliment Ohridski – Bitola
[2]tatjana_atanasoska@yahoo.com

Abstract. Nowadays, the issue of identifying, developing and supporting the talented and gifted children is of paramount importance. Educational institutions and in particular teachers and parents are responsible for identifying the advantages and the capabilities that a child has developed over time and, at the same time, for working further in advancing those talents to a higher level. Identification and development of the talents is important not only for a talented child but for the entire society. The educational policies should be oriented to the development of talents enabling the schools and teachers to organize different events with the sole intention of developing talents. Talented and gifted children are the potential for development for every country. Elementary school teachers should work closely with school professionals, physiologists and parents in regard to the talents in a class. If the talents and the potential are not identified, they cannot be further developed. Therefore, it is the duty of the teacher to follow and monitor every child and identify the characteristics that differ one child from another. Talented and gifted children have identifiable attributes including unusual vigilance, early fast learning, high language abilities, academical advantage, and higher capacity of knowledge. The objective of the study is through empirical research to find how much the teachers are engaged in identifying talented and gifted children. For the completion of the study the quantity approach will be applied, organized through an organized questionnaire with elementary school teachers.

Key words: gift, child, identification, teacher, talent.

Introduction

Talented and gifted pupils are at all levels of education and the task of teachers is to identify these students and support them to achieve as much as possible in their career and life.

For gift is not a recent concept, because it has been talked about in the field of education for several centuries. We can mention Jan Amos Komenski from the 17th century and some contemporaries, such as George, Travers, Tannenbaum, Mayer, Winner, Terman, Kovacić, Čudina Obradović and others (Adžić, 2011)

According to Gülsen Erden et al., the term gift was first used by Terman in 1925, and it was defined as “a degree of brightness that would rate them well within the top one percent of the population”. One of the most comprehensive definitions, which includes specific characteristics of gifted children, was first proposed by Marland in 1972 (Erden, G., I. Yiğit, C. Çelik & M. Guzey, 2020).

According to Marland, high-achieving children include those with demonstrated achievement and / or strong skills in any of the following areas - individually or in combination: general intellectual ability, specific academic ability, creative or productive thinking, ability directing, visual and performing arts, and psychomotor ability. It can be assumed that using

these criteria to identify the gifted will involve a minimum of 3 to 5 percent of the school population (Marland, 1972). Whereas, according to Lola Prioeto et al., approximately between 3 and 3.5 percent of school-age children have been identified as extremely talented (Prieto, L., J., Parra, C., Ferrándiz and C. Sánchez, 2004).

An administrative instruction has been issued by the MEST regarding talented and gifted students. By the term gift, we refer to the possession and use of an extraordinary natural ability, often called or known as a trend in a particular field, which makes the child stand out from his peers.

Talent refers to the possession of an extraordinary ability which the individual systematically develops, otherwise known as competence, in a certain field that makes the child / student different from peers (MEST, 2019). Nowadays, there is a tendency for various educational administrations to promote the improvement of educational attention to this group of students (Subotnik, RF, Olszewski-Kubilius, P., Worrell, FC, 2011), i.e., the enactment of laws is the main purpose of which is the establishment of different measures and strategies for attention to diversity according to specific needs. In developed countries, they issue laws, guidelines and implement them, paying special attention to the discovery of talented and gifted students.

However, in many countries, conditions in schools are not ideal, there is a lack of professional staff, there is a lack of teacher training, as well as a lack of resources needed to promote them. Comprehensive vocational training programs recognize that all educators work with talented students, hence all educators need a degree of professional preparation to support the education and upbringing of gifted children, although the amount and type of content may vary according to each educator's role (World Council for Gifted and Talented Children, 2021).

Talented and gifted children are children seeking differentiated education programs and / or services beyond the programs offered by the regular school curriculum, in order to realize their contribution to themselves and to the society (Ross, 1993). Therefore, any professional working with children should consider every child to be potentially talented and with special gifts.

1. LITERATURE REVIEW

1.1. Talented and gifted children

Children who are talented and gifted are a human resource of unique value. Talented and gifted students display extraordinary intellectual abilities or promises and are capable of extraordinary performance and achievement. These individuals are also very creative, innovative and motivated thinkers representing a great intellectual capital (Gallagher, 2008).

(We know that the terms extremely gifted and talented are concepts that, sometimes, cause certain confusion, because the term an extremely gifted person is reserved to children with high intellectual abilities in all fields, while we use the term talent for defining children who show high abilities in certain fields or areas such as art, music, sports and theatre) (Prieto, L., J., Parra, C., Ferrándiz and C. Sánchez, 2004).

The field of the education for the gifted is based on the almost universally accepted reality that some students demonstrate outstanding performance or potential for superior performance in academic fields, creative, managerial or artistic, when compared to their peers (Renzulli, 2012).

To identify talented and gifted students, teachers need to pay attention and care, as there are so many good attributes of students who are talented or gifted. Some of these students' attributes include unusual alertness, early and fast learning, rapid language development as a child, high language ability (oral fluency, extensive vocabulary and complex grammar), academic excellence, vast knowledge base, superior analytical skills, reasoning, high capacity memory, high curiosity and exploration, high career ambitions, active in receiving and exchanging information, pleasure of learning, reading, motivating others, demonstrating self-confidence, etc. (Okoye, 2013).

Whether the gift is inherited, developed, manifested in the ability to manipulate life situations, or is the result of any combination of these ideas, it is imperative that the regular classroom teacher be aware of the fact that there are high-achieving students in the classroom. Because these students are present, teachers have a responsibility to create a learning environment conducive to the success of these students. According to Lúcia Miranda and co-workers, gift is not a sustainable trait that invariably leads to success; it should be considered as a potential, which should be identified and stimulated by school and family to fully develop. Furthermore, a talent that is neglected or not promoted will surely fade (Miranda, 2013).

According to Behler and Snowman, students who learn and understand learning much faster than other students in the class or who display talent in one or more areas, also need to be specially trained to demonstrate their skills (Biehler, F. Robert & J. Snowman, 2004).

2.2. The role of the teacher in identifying talented and gifted students

The teacher has an important role in examining skills and talents, because of the specific information he or she has about students (Fraiser, M. M. et al., 1995). Just as parents are the primary educators of their children, teachers are primary and secondary educators. Consequently, teachers have the role of identifying the unique performances that are presented in their classrooms by their students in order to help them unfold and develop them (Okoye, 2013).

The sooner talented children are identified and provided with appropriate programs, the greater their chances of fully realizing their potential are. Conversely, when gifted young children fail to be challenged during their early years at school and in family situations, they tend to develop negative feelings about school and develop bad work habits, and then they become weak (Karnes, M. B. & L. J. Johnson, 1991) According to Marland, gifted and talented children are those who are identified by professionally qualified persons, who, based on their skills, are capable of high performance. These are children who seek differentiated education programs and / or services beyond those typically offered by the regular school curriculum to realize their contribution to themselves and society (Marland, 1972).

One of the procedures to determine a gifted child is to gather information on his / her behaviour and birth through a checklist (Prieto, L., J., Parra, C., Ferrándiz and C. Sánchez, 2004).

Through their daily contacts with students, teachers manage to observe specific signs of the highest potential and, consequently, are in the position to carry out a preliminary identification of talent that can be supplemented with further observation and psychological evaluation. In addition, teacher-student relationships can also provide sound information to confirm this first intuition and provide more appropriate educational services for particular students (Siegle, D., & Powell, T., 2004). Whereas identification should be based on general intellectual ability, language arts, mathematics, science, social studies, creativity, and leadership, it is the duty of a teacher to consider the interests of students when developing enrichment programs for gifted students. It is vital to explore students' personal interests because their intrinsic motivation, skills development, and performance increase when their areas of personal interest are involved (Okoye, 2013).

Although early identification of high potential is considered important (Dowdall, C. B. & Colangelo, N., 1982), and has been shown to reduce the risk of developing social, emotional and educational problems (Kuo CC, Maker J, Su FL and Hu C., 2010), it is not without concerns (Lohman, D. F., & Lakin, J. M., 2011). Some of the ways teachers can discover students' interests are through conversation, official interviews, and interest inventories. Using the interview is essential because it will help the teacher to gain further knowledge in identifying students' characteristics and interests that were not obvious or easily measurable in the classroom environment.

It is appropriate to make a few points: first, although each extremely talented student is unique, many of them share the same characteristics. Second, studies show that when teachers use the checklist, the chances of successfully identifying extremely talented students are very high. Third, no child has all the qualities on the list, but it is true that many of the skills

on the list remind us of typical behaviours that children are capable of (Prieto, L., J., Parra, C., Ferrándiz and C Sánchez, 2004).

Although the teacher has a privileged position to discover the characteristics of extremely talented children, however, the teacher, in general terms, tends to value the diligent child as an intelligent child, obedient as calm, forgetting the anxious child who usually complicates things, and asks embarrassing questions, which makes it difficult for the teacher to be creative and enigmatic because of their original and unusual responses; some of them show the characteristics of extremely talented children. (Prieto, L., J., Parra, C., Ferrándiz and C. Sánchez, 2004). Teachers should therefore be careful about how they evaluate their students.

2. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

2.1. The purpose of the research

The purpose of the study is to find out through empirical research how engaged teachers are in identifying talented and gifted pupils.

2.2. Research questions

1. Do conditions at school affect teacher engagement in identifying talented and gifted pupils?
2. Are there differences between teachers who have completed training and those who have not completed training in identifying talented and gifted pupils?
3. What is the difference between teachers with different experience in identifying the talented and the gifted?
4. Does the gender of teachers play a role in engaging in identifying talented and gifted pupils?

2.3. Research participants

In this research 311 primary school teachers are included, of which 234 are female and 77 male. Of these, 9 are up to 30 years of age, 102 are aged from 31 to40 years, 74 are aged 41-50, 95 of them are aged 51-60, and 31 teachers are over 60 years old. In terms of studies, 27 have completed high school 2 years, 29 bachelor 3 years, 225 of them have completed bachelor 4 years, 30 have completed master. Of them, 13 have experience up to 5 years, 55 have experience 6-10 years, 96 have experience 11-20 years, 147 have over 20 years of experience. Regarding the trainings for talented and gifted students, 137 of them have not completed such trainings, while 174 have completed trainings for talented and gifted pupils.

2.4. Research instruments

A Likert scale instrument was used to conduct the research, specially compiled for this research. The questionnaire consists of 3 parts: in the first part, the general data about teachers are presented (gender, age, educational level, experience in education, completed trainings, etc.); in the second part, instructions are given on how to complete the questionnaire, while in the third part, 13 questions are presented. The Likert scale answers are: 5. Strongly Agree, 4. Agree, 3. Neutral, 2. Disagree,1. I do not agree at all, but for practical reasons these degrees have been reduced to three: 3. High commitment (levels 4 and 5), 2. Medium commitment (level 3) and 1. Low commitment (levels 1 and 2).

2.4.1. Instrument reliability

Through Alpha Chronbach's model, the reliability of 13 items was measured, relating to the role of the teacher in identifying talented and gifted students. Based on the results, it can be seen that the reliability of the meter is 0.782, while the predicted reliability is 0.796. From this result, it can be concluded that the instrument used is highly reliable and meets the condition for use in practice.

Table no. 1. The reliability of the instrument according to the model Alpha Chronbach's

Reliability Statistics		
Cronbach's Alpha	Cronbach's Alpha Based on Standardized Items	N of Items
.782	.796	13

2.5. Statistical analysis

The data from the research were analysed through the Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS). To test the internal consistency of the instruments, the Alpha Cronbach model was used, based on a value above 0.7, as a value that proves whether or not the questionnaire has internal consistency. The level of statistical significance is set for the evaluation of the results of all statistical tests 0.05.

To test the hypotheses: There are statistically significant differences between female and male teachers in their commitment to identifying gifted and gifted students. School conditions affect teachers' commitment to identifying talented and gifted students. Teachers who have trained talented students engage more in identifying talented and gifted students than teachers who have not completed training: the parametric T-test was used. To test the hypothesis: There are statistically significant differences between teachers with different experience in identifying talented and gifted students, the one-way ANOVA parametric test was used. The Levin test was used to assess homogeneity of variance.

3. RESULTS

3.1. Descriptive results

About 66.3% of teachers have high cooperation with students' parents to identify students' tendencies, 28.9% of teachers have an average commitment, while 4.8% of teachers have low commitment with students' parents to identify pupils' tendencies, M = 3.95, DS = 0.906.

About 88.4% of teachers have high interest in students' tendencies and difficulties, 11% of them have average interest, while 0.6% of teachers have low interest in students' tendencies and difficulties, M = 4.4, DS = 0.733. About 84.6% of teachers have a high commitment with the parents of the children to identify the talents and gifts of the students, 15.4% of the teachers have a medium level commitment, M = 4.26, DS = 0.709.

About 85.9% of teachers have a high commitment in reading student files, 14.1%, have an average commitment, M = 4.42, DS = 0.727. About 97.1% of teachers have a high-level cooperation with student educators, 2.9% of them have an average cooperation, M = 4.72, DS = 0.509. About 81.1% of teachers have a high commitment in following the interests of students, 17% of them have a medium level commitment, and 1.9% have a low-level commitment, M = 4.05, DS = 0.714.

About 90.4% of teachers have a high level of interest in engaging students in various fields, following them in problem solving, while 9.6% of teachers have an average interest, M = 4.51, DS = 0.666.

About 79.5% of teachers have a high level of interest in following the actions of each student in order to identify their talents and gifts, 15.1% have an average commitment, while 5.4% of teachers have a low-level interest in tracking the actions of each student in order to identify their talents and gifts, M = 4.09, DS = 0.866.

About 57.2% of teachers engage in individual work with students to identify talents and gifts, 29.9% of them have an average commitment, while 12.9% of them have a low-level commitment, M = 3.69, DS = 1.051.

About 65.3% of teachers have a high-level commitment to consult with professionals to identify talented and gifted students, 34.7% of them have an average commitment, M = 4.01, DS = 0.839.

About 68.5% of teachers have an interest in using different instruments and methods to identify talented and gifted students, about 18.3% of them have an average commitment, while 13.2% of teachers have an engagement of low level, M = 3.8, DS = 0.960.

About 92.6% of teachers have a high commitment in identifying the identified talents and gifts, 7.4% of them have in average level engagement, M = 4.5, DS = 0.632.

Overall results showed that about 80.7% of teachers are engaged at a high level in identifying talented and gifted students, 16.3% of them have a medium level commitment, and 3% of teachers have a low-level commitment; the overall average of the results is M = 4.2.

Table no. 2. Descriptive statistics results

Identify talented pupils	**3. High**	**2.Secondary**	**1. Low**	**M**	**DS**
Collaborate very closely with students' parents on student trends	66.3%	28.9%	4.8%	3.95	.906
I am interested in the tendencies and difficulties of students	88.4%	11%	0.6%	4.40	.733
I engage with parents to identify students' talents	84.6%	15.4%	0%	4.26	.709
I read the student kindergarten file	85.9%	14.1%	0%	4.42	.727
Collaborate with student educators	97.1%	2.9%	0%	4.72	.509
Talk to students about their aptitudes and interests	92%	8%	0%	4.60	.633
Follow students' interests	81.1%	17%	1.9%	4.05	.714
Engage students in different areas and guide them how to solve problems	90.4%	9.6%	0%	4.51	.666
Track the actions of each student to identify their talents and gifts	79.5%	15.1%	5.4%	4.09	.866
I work individually with students to identify talents and gifts	57.2%	29.9%	12.9%	3.69	1.051
I consult with professionals to identify talented and gifted students	65.3%	34.7%	0%	4.01	.839
Use various instruments and methods to identify talented and gifted students	68.5%	18.3%	13.2%	3.80	.960
Identify talents and gifts	92.6%	7.4%	0%	4.50	.632
Overall results	**80.7%**	**16.3%**	**3%**	**4.2**	/ / /

3.2. Results related to the hypotheses

Hypothesis 1:

Alternative Hypothesis (HA): School conditions affect teachers' commitment to identifying talented and gifted students. Hypothesis null (H0): School conditions have no bearing on teachers to engage in identifying talented and gifted students.

Hypothesis testing was performed through the parametric T-test. Based on the results of the part of Levin test, we notice that the value of F = 10.231, while p = 0.002 <0.05, which is an indication that the variances are not homogeneous.

Based on the averages of teachers who have responded to school conditions, we note that the highest average in the commitment to identify talented and gifted students have the teachers who have stated that in the school where they work there are conditions for identifying and treating talented and gifted students, M = 55.6, while teachers who said that the conditions in the school where they work are not favourable for the identification and treatment of talented and gifted students, M = 52.77. In terms of statistical significance, for both Equal variances assumed, and Equal variances not assumed, p <0.005. So, the differences are statistically significant between teachers who have conditions and those who do not have conditions in school for identifying and treating talented and gifted pupils.

The results showed that the alternative hypothesis was supported, i.e., school conditions significantly influence teachers to engage in identifying talented and gifted pupils.

Table no. 3. Differences between teachers based on school conditions

Group Statistics					
	Are there conditions in the school for identifying and treating talented and gifted pupils?	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Identify talented pupils and gifted	No	65	52.7692	6.57592	.81564
	Yes	246	55.6057	4.78294	.30495

Independent Samples Test									
Identify talented pupils and gifted ones	Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means						
	F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
								Lower	Upper
Equal variances assumed	10.231	.002	-3.907	309	.000	-2.83646	.72594	-4.26487	-1.40806
Equal variances not assumed			-3.257	82.721	.002	-2.83646	.87079	-4.56850	-1.10442

Hypothesis 2:

Alternative Hypothesis (HA): Teachers who have conducted training for gifted students engage more in identifying talented and gifted students than teachers who have not completed training.

Hypothesis null (H0): There are no differences between teachers who have completed and those who have not completed training in identifying talented and gifted students.

Based on the results, it turned out that the highest average for the identification of talented and gifted students goes to the teachers who have completed training for talented and gifted students, M = 55.5, while the average of the results of teachers who have not completed training is M = 5.2.

In the table, Independent Samples Test, where Levin's test is presented, it is noticed that the value of F is low, F = 0.063, while p = 0.802, which is an indication that the variances are homogeneous. In terms of statistical significance, we note that for both Equal variances assumed, and Equal variances not assumed, p> 0.05.

The results showed that the differences between teachers who have conducted training for talented and gifted students and those who have not completed training are not statistically significant. From this we can conclude that the null hypothesis is supported, and the alternative hypothesis has been rejected

Table no. 4. Teacher differences based on training

Group Statistics					
	Trainings for talented and gifted students	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Identify talented and gifted students	No	137	54.3942	5.43052	.46396
	Yes	174	55.5000	5.20199	.39436

Independent Samples Test									
Identify talented and gifted students	Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means						
	F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
								Lower	Upper
Equal variances assumed	.063	.802	-1.825	309	.069	-1.10584	.60580	-2.29786	.08618
Equal variances not assumed			-1.816	286.104	.070	-1.10584	.60892	-2.30437	.09269

Hypothesis 3:

Alternative Hypothesis (HA): There are statistically significant differences between teachers with different experiences in identifying talented and gifted students;
Hypothesis zero (H0): Teaching experience plays no role in identifying talented and gifted students.

In the table where the results of the descriptive analysis are presented, there are averages of the results of teachers who are engaged in identifying talented and gifted students, based on their experience. Based on the results, teachers who have up to 5 years of teaching experience, in terms of identifying talented and gifted students, have the highest average, M = 56.84, then there are teachers who have 6-10 years of experience, M = 56.27, then are teachers with experience over 20 years, M = 55.45, while the lowest average is teachers with experience 11-20 years, M = 5.13.

In the table where the results of the one-way ANOVA test are presented, we find that the value of F = 5.146, while p = 0.002 <0.05.

Empirical results showed that teachers with different experiences have different engagements in identifying talented and gifted students, where the highest engagement goes to teachers with the least experience. These results showed that the differences are statistically significant.

From the empirical results, it was found that the alternative hypothesis was supported, and the null hypothesis was rejected.

Table no. 5. Differences in teacher outcomes based on experience

Descriptives						
Identify talented and gifted pupils						
	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error	95% Confidence Interval for Mean	
					Lower Bound	Upper Bound
up to 5 Years	13	56.8462	4.79316	1.32938	53.9497	59.7426
6-10 Years	55	56.2727	6.09935	.82244	54.6238	57.9216
11-20	96	53.3646	5.13014	.52359	52.3251	54.4040
Over 20 years	147	55.4558	4.95214	.40845	54.6486	56.2630
Total	311	55.0129	5.32370	.30188	54.4189	55.6069

ANOVA					
Identify talented and gifted pupils					
	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	420.645	3	140.215	5.146	.002
Within Groups	8365.304	307	27.249		

Total	8785.949	310			

Hypothesis 4:

Alternative Hypothesis (HA): There are statistically significant differences between female and male teachers in their commitment to identifying talented and gifted pupils.

Hypothesis zero (HO): There are no differences between female and male teachers in their commitment to identifying talented and gifted students. The group statistic table presents descriptive statistics, average and standard deviation of female and male teachers, regarding the commitment to identify talented and gifted students. Based on the results, we notice that the highest average is given to female teachers, M = 55.21, while the average of male teachers' results is M = 54.38.

In the table Independent Samples Test, the Levin test of variance homogeneity and the value of F are presented. The value of F = 0.292, while p = 0.589; these values are indicative that the variances are homogeneous.

In terms of statistical significance, for both Equal variances assumed, and Equal variances not assumed p> 0.05. From these results we understand that the differences between female and male teachers are not statistically significant.

The results showed that the null hypothesis was supported, since there are no statistically significant differences between female and male teachers in their commitment to identifying talented and gifted pupils.

Table no. 6. Teacher differences based on gender

Group Statistics					
	Gender	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Identify talented students and gifted	Female	234	55.2179	5.38870	.35227
	Male	77	54.3896	5.10458	.58172

Independent Samples Test									
Identify talented students and gifted	Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means						
	F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
								Lower	Upper
Equal variances assumed	.292	.589	1.185	309	.237	.82834	.69897	-.54700	2.20368
Equal variances not assumed			1.218	135.995	.225	.82834	.68007	-.51654	2.17322

4. CONCLUSIONS

Based on the empirical results, it was found that the majority, somewhere around 80.7%, have a high-level commitment to identify talented and gifted students, while only 3% of teachers have a low-level commitment. If we also look at the overall average of the results, we notice that it is quite high, M = 4.2. Results showed that teachers are quite dedicated and play an important role in identifying talented and gifted students. School conditions play an important role in identifying talented and gifted students. In schools where there are favourable conditions, teachers have the best opportunities to deal with talented and gifted students and vice versa - teachers are powerless where there are no tools in schools or space, where they work in three shifts, etc., to be dedicated to identifying talented and gifted students.

Empirical results showed that in schools where there are good conditions, teachers are more engaged in identifying talented and gifted students, which differences are statistically significant. It is difficult for teachers to deal with sensitive issues, such as identifying talented and gifted students, without conditions. In order to continuously advance and prepare, various trainings for teachers are organized by educational institutions. Teachers have also conducted trainings for the treatment of talented and gifted pupils.

Based on the results, it was found that teachers who have conducted training for talented and gifted students, have a higher commitment than teachers who have not conducted such training, but the differences between them are statistically insignificant. Based on these results, it was found that the null hypothesis was supported. Despite these results, teachers need to engage in training, but school managers and other instances need to monitor whether these trainings are being implemented in practice.

Experience in teaching is an important factor, but with experience comes age and fatigue of teachers, and a lack of proper engagement. Based on the empirical results, it was found that teachers with the least experience, up to 5 years, have a higher commitment in identifying talented and gifted students. This is an indication that teachers who have just started working may have even the freshest theoretical knowledge, no routine work has been done, and they are intrigued by more specific cases, while for teachers who have already established experience many things are routine.

From the empirical results, it was found that the alternative hypothesis was supported, and the null hypothesis was rejected. Gender can sometimes play an important role, e.g., female teachers may be more sensitive, have more developed intuition than male teachers, but this does not happen in every situation. In terms of commitment to identifying talented and gifted students, female teachers have shown a higher commitment, but the difference in commitment is not statistically significant and the null hypothesis is supported.

References

Adžić, D. (2011). Darovitost i rad s darovitim učenicima, Kako teoriju prenijeti u praksu. *Život i škola*, 171-184.

Biehler, F. Robert&J. Snowman. (2004). *Psikologjia e zbatuar në mësimdhënie.* Tiranë: ISP.

Dowdall, C. B.&Colangelo, N. (1982). Underachieving gifted students: Review and implications. *Gifted Child Quarterly*, 179-184.

Erden, G., I. Yiğit, C. Çelik&M. Guzey. (2020). The diagnostic utility of the Wechsler Intelligence Scale for Children-Fourth Edition (WISC-IV) in identification of gifted children. *The Journal of General Psychology*, 1-20.

Fraiser, M. M. et al. (1995). *Educators' perception of barriers to the identification of gifted children from economically disadvantaged and limited English proficient backgrounds.* Washington, DC.: National Research Center on the Gifted and Talented, Storrs, CT.

Gallagher, J. (2008). Psychology, psychologists, and gifted students . Në In S. I. Pfeiffer (Ed.), *Handbook of giftedness in children* (fv. 1-12). New York: NY: Springer.

Karnes, M. B. & L. J. Johnson . (1991). The Preschool/Primary Gifted Child. *Journal for the Education of the Gifted*, 267-283.

Kuo CC, Maker J, Su FL and Hu C. (2010). Identifying young talented children and cultivatingproblem solving abilities and multiple intelligences. *Learning and Individual Differences* , 365–379.

Lohman, D. F., & Lakin, J. M. (2011). Intelligence and reasoning. Në I. R. (Eds.), *The Cambridge handbook of intelligence* (fv. 419-441). New York: NY: Cambridge University Press.

Marland, S. P. (1972). *Education of the Gifted and Talented: Report to the Congress of the United States by the U.S. Commissioner of Education and Background Papers Submitted to the U.S. Office of Education.* Washington: Washington, DC: U.S. Government Pr.

MASHT. (2019). *Udhëzim Administrativ dhe udhëzuesi për fëmijët/nxënësit me aftësi të jashtëzakonshme , dhunti dhe talente.* Prishtinë: MASHT.

Miranda, L. C. (2013). Identification of gifted students by teachers: reliability and validity of the cognitive abilities and learning scale. *Revista de Investigación y Divulgación en Psicología y Logopedia* , 14-18 .

Okoye, M. D. (2013). Roles of Parents and Teachers in the Identification and Development of Gifted/Talented Students,. *Academic Journal of Interdisciplinary Studies*, 25-35.

Prieto, L., J., Parra, C., Ferrándiz and C. Sánchez. (2004). The role of the teacher within the identification of gifted students.

Prieto, M. D. et al. (2006). creative abilities in earlychildhood. *Journal of Early Childhood Research*, 277-290.

Renzulli, J. S. (2012). Reexamining the Role of Gifted Education and Talent Development for the 21st Century: A Four-Part Theoretical Approach. *National Association for Gifted Children*, 150-159.

Ross, P. O. (1993). *National Excellence: A Case for Developing America's Talent.* Washington: US Department OF Education.

Siegle, D., & Powell, T. (2004). Exploring teacher biases when nominating students for gifted programs. . *Gifted Child Quarterly*, 21–29.

Subotnik, R.F., Olszewski-Kubilius, P., Worrell, F.C. (2011). Rethinking giftedness and gifted education: A proposed direction forward based on psychological science. *Psychol. Sci. Public Interest*, 3–54.

World Council for Gifted and Talented Children. (2021). Global principles for professional learning in gifted education. *World Council for Gifted and Talented Children. https:// world-gifted.org/professional-learning-global-principles.pdf*.