

# GIFTED PROGRAMMING IDENTIFICATION PROCEDURES: A HIDDEN CURRICULUM

**VICKI BOLEY**

COLORADO STATE UNIVERSITY - PUEBLO

**DOI:** <https://doi.org/10.51734/r906cq21>

## **ABSTRACT**

What is giftedness? Centering research on Diné (Navajo) perceptions of giftedness (Hartley 1991), this paper posits that gifted programming identification procedures often epitomize a unique and dangerous hidden curriculum founded on White, Westernized narratives surrounding intelligence. Drawing from theory on critical positionality (Johnson-Bailey 2012) and hope (Duncan-Andrade 2009), two tables are presented: one to examine hokey versus critical gifted programming practices, and one to examine dehumanizing versus humanizing gifted identification procedures, with corresponding implications and questions to consider further. Toward decolonizing the field of gifted education, these tables are intended to generate discussion on what happens when diverse ways of conceptualizing giftedness decenter Western ways of understanding, informing, and ordering the field of gifted education.

## **KEY WORDS:**

gifted education, giftedness, intelligence, hidden curriculum, Indigenous

## **RECOMMENDED CITATION**

Boley, V. (2024). Gifted Programming Identification Procedures: A Hidden Curriculum. *Rio Bravo: A Journal of the Borderlands*, 25, 184-196

The issue at the heart of racist schooling is not whether or not there exist individuals who are dedicated, talented, and successful. The issue is that our educational institutions, policies, and practices are structured by White supremacy, and as such they deny Black and Brown youth the myriad resources necessary for equitable schooling. It should not be an accident or a stroke of good fortune that a Black or Brown child receives a good education. It should be a systemic, structural guarantee. (Vaught 2011, 208-209)

What is giftedness? Numerous complex definitions of giftedness exist (Sousa 2009). Giftedness is often associated with a person who demonstrates, or has the potential for demonstrating, an exceptionally high level of performance in one or more areas of human endeavor (Sousa 2009). The purpose of gifted education is not only to identify gifted students, but to ensure they receive appropriate support for their complex cognitive, affective, and behavioral needs toward the goal of developing their unique gifts and talents (Delisle and Galbraith 2015). However, many working understandings of giftedness exist within dominating Western frameworks, often rendering gifted identification procedures that take the form of a hidden curriculum, gatekeeping gifted programming from students who do not “fit” inside such frameworks (Owens et al. 2018; Rinn et al. 2020). Consequently, the underrepresentation of Black, Indigenous and People of Color (BIPOC) students plagues gifted K-12 programming throughout the United States (Cross 2021; Rinn et al. 2020). In a large study of gifted identification practices, Hodges et al. (2018) identified the “risk ratio” for BIPOC students being identified for gifted education as 0.34; In other words, these students are about one-third as likely to be identified for gifted education as White students. Instead of examining culturally incongruent philosophical perspectives and philosophies of giftedness (Herring 1996), many educational policy makers are eliminating K-12 gifted programming entirely (Silverman and Davies 2021). Thus, as Battiste posits, a critical approach to illuminating such a hidden curriculum begins with “the unpacking of Eurocentric assumptions of education, the normalized discourses and discursive practices that bestow ignorance on students, while it bestows layers of meaningless knowledge on to youth that hide the social and economic structures of Eurocentrism, white dominance, and racism” (2013, 106). Accordingly, critical understandings of positionality and hope may lend toward decentering Westernized narratives surrounding giftedness, decolonizing gifted programming and identification procedures, centering attention on non-Western conceptions of giftedness as valuable, as well as acknowledging the cultural dimensions of giftedness toward more culturally responsive approaches to gifted education in both theory and practice.

## **POSITIONALITY WITHIN THE FIELD OF GIFTED EDUCATION**

At the beginning of the 20th century, giftedness was conceptualized as high intellectual functioning, often aligning with eugenicist Lewis Terman’s revision of the intelligence test published by French scholars Alfred Binet and Theodore Simon (Brookwood 2016). Terman asserted that intelligence tests would be used to further the agenda of race hygiene, eliminate

degeneracy, and prove non-white races possessed limited intelligence (Brookwood 2016). Thus, since its conception, the field of gifted education has systematically encapsulated a position of ethnocentricity rooted in white, Western traditions and definitions of cultural heritage, history, values, language, and beliefs (Owens et al. 2018). Now, monocultural, racially biased notions of intelligence (hooks 2003) deteriorate the field of gifted education (Cross 2021; Rinn et al. 2020) and often, whether explicitly or implicitly, perpetuate inequity and disproportionality throughout the field in both theory and practice, especially regarding *how* children are identified as gifted (Hodges et al. 2018). Many gifted K-12 programs are being eliminated in the name of providing more equitable educational experiences for students; however, sacrificing gifted education programs is a misguided attempt to reduce racism and ultimately prevents brilliant, talented members of diverse cultural groups from being discovered, nurtured, and valued (Silverman and Davis 2021). As such, considering positionality in conversations surrounding the ethnocentric education canon may lend toward critically questioning, and subsequently transforming, said canon (Johnson-Bailey 2012). Without such a transformation, many gifted BIPOC students are left unidentified and passed over for special programming and subsequent learning opportunities (Hodges et al., 2018). Therefore, before examining the hidden nature of gifted identification procedures, it is essential to first consider positionality as it relates to overall gifted education, namely gifted programming and services throughout K-12 schools.

### **CENTERING INDIGENOUS POSITIONALITY TOWARD EDUCATION AND INTELLIGENCE**

Considering positionality allows stakeholders in the field of gifted education to ask questions such as “what position/perspective informs gifted education and what position/perspective is omitted?” as well as “what happens when diverse ways of conceptualizing giftedness meet old ways of understanding, informing, and ordering the field of gifted education?” (adapted from Johnson-Bailey 2012, 261). For instance, taking a closer look at the positionality of one of the most under-identified, underperforming, and overlooked groups of students, Native Americans, (Gentry and Fugate 2012) lends profoundly toward examining gifted identification practices. Specifically, the terms *gifted*, *education*, *science*, and *art* do not exist in many Indigenous languages (Cajete 2000; Hartley 1991). The Hupa, Yurok, and Karuk of the Hoopa Valley describe giftedness as *k'winya'nya:nma-awhiniw* (the human way) and consider it to be manifested through *niltsit* (an inherited gift), *xoL-diniL'ay* (a learned gift), and community contributions (Lara 2009). Rural Kenyan conceptions of intelligence fall under four domains, including *rieko* (knowledge and skills), *luoro* (respect), *winjo* (comprehension of how to handle real-life problems) and *parao* (initiative) (Munro 2011). The Alaskan Yup'ik community deeply values practical intelligence and tacit knowledge of outdoor navigation skills (Sternberg 2007). In the Shona Indigenous communities of Zimbabwe, Bantu philosophical thinking emphasizes the innateness of giftedness as “given” at birth, in which the giver is the Spirit-God, and the ability to succeed against odds and adversity through vision, passion, and wit (Ngara, 2006). Often, “knowledge among Indigenous people is acquired in a completely different way” from Western approaches, in which “the value of the effort, the coming to know, is found in the journey, in

addition to or rather than, the end result” (80-81). Unlike many Western philosophies surrounding education, intelligence is often considered conceptually as a “coming to know,” which metaphorically “entails a journey, a process, a quest for knowledge and understanding” (Cajete 2000, 81). In this regard, unlike Western approaches to conceptualizing intelligence that prioritize achievement in some tangible form (such as a degree), the aim of education is not the target but the act of hitting the target (Dewey 1916/1944).

Accordingly, Indigenous processes, practices, and reflections surrounding education organically embody “the natural system, characteristics of diversity, optimization, cooperation, self-regulation, change, creativity, connectedness, and niche,” which certainly should inform Western approaches to gifted education (64). To further contextualize positionality within education and ways of knowing, Robert Yazzie, the chief justice of the Navajo Nation (1996 as cited in Cajete 2000, 64), explains:

Navajo philosophy is not a philosophy in the Western sense of the word; it is the lived practices of cultural forms that embody the Navajo understanding of their connectivity in the worlds of spirits of nature, humans, animals, plants, minerals, and other natural phenomena. However, explained in terms of Western thought it may be viewed as the practice of an epistemology in which the mind embodies itself in a particular relationship with all other aspects of the world. For me as a Navajo, these other aspects are my relations. I have a duty toward them as they have a duty as a relative toward me.

Moreover, in considering positionality in approaches to education, Cajete clarifies that “elders provide guidance and facilitate learning, often through story along with artifacts and manifestations of traditions, but it is the individual’s responsibility to learn,” noting that “even the ‘trickster’ (chaos) may facilitate creative understanding, and this role in whatever form it is played is highly respected” (2000, 66). Thus, the process of “coming to know” of Indigenous positionality “revolves around the natural creative process of human learning” (65). As such, in examining positionality within the field of gifted education, one must ask whose is the “main” in mainstream and whose experiences are normalized as center (Battiste 2013)? Furthermore, while Westernized positionality toward intelligence and education tends to lean more individualist, with students being singled-out, so to speak, for gifted programming, Indigenous positionality often emphasizes connectedness and community (Cajete 2000).

### **DINÉ (NAVAJO) CONCEPTIONS OF GIFTEDNESS**

To further examine positionality in the field of gifted education, it is crucial to acknowledge the way in which knowledge, knowing, and domains of giftedness exist at the intersection of the child and their context (Dai 2021). For example, in their study examining Diné (Navajo) perceptions of giftedness, Hartley (1991) found that Diné children were often identified as gifted by their communities when they a) appeared humble; b) demonstrated aural/oral memory; c) were quiet, observant, and non-competitive; d) only asked enough questions to efficiently guide a task;

e) rarely expressed feelings openly; f) used traditional ways of knowing and community connections to self-regulate and guide problem-solving; and g) were multilingual. Using Hartley's community-engaged research findings, it can be said that many Diné children identified as gifted by their teachers, parents, and community members are thus those who rarely asked questions, respected and internalized rules and rituals, were quiet, observant, and perceptive, rarely outwardly expressed emotion, desired long periods of rumination on ideas, and used Indigenous ways of knowing and being to approach problem-solving, both personal and educational (Hartley 1991; Peterson 1999). These findings on gifted characteristics differ from many Western interpretations and characteristics of giftedness often used to identify students as gifted, such as a) persistent questioning, b) obstinance in task decisions, c) leveraging of extroverted humor, d) expressive emotion and intensity, e) desire for rapid pace of instruction, and f) individualist approaches to self-regulation and problem-solving (Delisle and Galbraith 2015; Sousa 2009). Furthermore, similar to other Indigenous groups, Hartley's research revealed that "there [is] no general term for 'gifted'" in the Diné language (1991, 61).

Hartley's (1991) study also revealed that some manifestations of giftedness, such as intense interests, original thinking, problem-solving, and imaginative expression, *are* characteristics of giftedness that seem to transcend cultural groups; however, researchers, practitioners, and stakeholders (such as parents of gifted children) in the field of gifted education also need to consider and acknowledge how those characteristics are anchored to, once again, the intersection of the child and their social and cultural context (Dai 2021; Sternberg 2007). For instance, the deep imaginative expression of a Diné child might look different than the imaginative expression valued within a mainstream population; however, the Diné child's gifted imaginative expression is of equal reverence and such talent deserves to be identified, developed, and valued. While one Indigenous group is not representative of all Indigenous groups, such research findings certainly reveal just how aligned with Western, mainstream culture the purpose and practices of gifted education often are, particularly in regard to understanding the characteristics of giftedness.

Yet, educators may not recognize students who do not demonstrate individualistic, assertive, and competitive behaviors as gifted, resulting in fewer opportunities to be "nominated for scholarships, leadership experiences, special positions on teams or committees, or gifted programs" (Peterson 1999, 375). Moreover, "educators may not recognize that considerable comfort in the [classroom] is likely a prerequisite for many or most of the gifted behaviors they are looking for and that cultural differences may inhibit or even preclude those behaviors" (375). Thus, the nature and needs of gifted children not only differ from their typical peers, but within the gifted capacity based on social and cultural context as well (Sternberg 2007). Once again, such a situation demands that the field of gifted education consider "whose is the 'main' that is 'streamed?'" (Battiste 2013, 107). To identify gifted potential equitably and inclusively, the sociocultural context of the child must be considered (Munro 2011).

## **GIFTED EDUCATION: A HIDDEN CURRICULUM?**

Many gifted K-12 programs and services are systematically designed around Westernized educational philosophies that inherently promote a monocultural narrative surrounding notions of intelligence (Duncan-Andrade 2009; Owens et al. 2018). These K-12 programs often boast inclusive, dynamic gifted education philosophies, but their actual day-to-day programming practices tend to be dehumanizing rather than humanizing in nature (see Table 1). Specifically, such programs generally claim to use humanizing, culturally responsive criteria for gifted identification, but ultimately fall back on dehumanizing criteria, such as IQ scores and standardized testing data, to act as all-defining indicators of giftedness (Ford and Grantham 2003; Hodges et al. 2018; Owens et al. 2018). By nature, the idea that a standardized test and/or test data can single-handedly identify something as dynamic as giftedness supports a reductive, mechanistic approach to education and promotes a “one-size-fits-all paradigm” (Hodges et al. 2018; Salazar 2013, 124). While such “pedestrian approaches [to gifted identification] are easily routinized,” they are “an embarrassment, representing shallow attempts to identify students who think deeply” (Sternberg 2007, 165).

**Table 1**  
*Gifted Programming Practices*

<b>Hokey programming practices</b>	<b>Critical programming practices</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• District/school gifted education philosophies that do not match with operational practices—hokey hope vs. critical hope (Duncan-Andrade 2009; Wells 2021)</li> <li>• Surface-level inclusion of diversity, inclusion, and social-justice within gifted programming (Salazar 2013)</li> <li>• Use of narrow, standardized testing to identify students for gifted programming (Salazar 2013; Wells 2021)</li> <li>• One-size-fits-all gifted programming (de la Ruz Reyes as cited in Salazar 2013)</li> <li>• Programming that emphasizes cultural replacement, particularly of native languages (Salazar 2013)</li> <li>• Use of reductionistic, decontextualized, and fragmented gifted curriculum and services (Bahruth 2000 as cited in Salazar 2013)</li> <li>• White-centric relational images attached to overall notions of giftedness that are consistently sustained by programming (Salazar 2013)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Programming as a community of cultural wealth (Yosso 2005 as cited in Salazar 2013)</li> <li>• Interrupt patterns of exclusion (Giroux 2004 as cited in Salazar 2013)</li> <li>• Honor “cultural funds of knowledge as resources for academic success” as part of the gifted experience (Salazar &amp; Fránquiz 2008 as cited in Salazar 2013, 134)</li> <li>• “Problem-posing education” evident throughout programming and services (Salazar 2013, 133)</li> <li>• Emphasize student interests, experiences, and emotions (Dale &amp; Hysop-Margison 2010 as cited in Salazar 2013) and opportunities to co-construct knowledge (Salazar 2013)</li> <li>• Actively seek ongoing critical reflection and dialogue to better programming and services (Salazar 2013)</li> <li>• Seek mutual humanization among program teachers and gifted students (Freire 1970 as cited in Salazar 2013)</li> </ul>

Moreover, Munro (2011) explains that traditional intelligence, achievement, and standardized tests used to identify middle-class White students as gifted may be less effective for gifted students from Black, Hispanic, and Indigenous backgrounds for a number of reasons. These students may be 1) unaccustomed to answering questions simply for the purpose of showing knowledge; rather, they display their knowledge in response to authentic problems or issues; 2) perform poorly on paper-and-pencil tasks conducted in artificial settings; 3) perform poorly on culturally loaded tests, particularly those structured in a culture other than their own; 4) have learning and/or cognitive styles that differ from White students; and 5) have test anxiety surrounding stereotype threat (Munro 2011). Thus, due to their narrow and unidimensional focus, many definitions, perceptions, and theories of intelligence and giftedness based exclusively or extensively on intelligence tests close many doors, so to speak, for diverse students (Ford and Grantham 2003). In many ways, the issue of gifted programming philosophy versus gifted programming practice relates to Duncan-Andrade's notion of hokey hope versus critical hope. School districts imploring hokey hope often project "some kind of multicultural, middle-class opportunity structure that is inaccessible to the overwhelming majority of working-class, urban youth of color," in which their espoused gifted education philosophies do not align with their practices (2009, 183).

As a result, in school districts where gifted identification procedures do not align with espoused humanizing gifted philosophies (see Table 2), identification procedures become a unique and dangerous hidden curriculum that gatekeeps access to gifted education. "Inequality doesn't look like Jim Crow laws of the pre-Civil Rights era. Instead, it takes the form of seemingly benign institutional practices or structures that reduce and limit opportunities for people of color, poor people, and immigrants" (Hammond 2015, 29). Such a hidden curriculum centers gifted identification within in a Western narrative, creating a circuitous effect in which gifted programming, post-identification, is also designed to better serve White, middle-class populations of students (Owens et al. 2018). Battiste explains that, in this respect, "whiteness is hidden in [the] system" and becomes "the measure for success or failure" (2013, 106). Consequently, the "rewards for whiteness are not critiqued for the benefit and rewards it gives to a few and the kinds of punishment and low outcomes it gives to those who are different" (106). It is often the case that K-12 public education routinely approaches cultural responsiveness from a deficit-orientation, often "giving" students the opportunity to "catch up with Johnny" (Herring 1996).

However, through an asset-orientation, the more humanizing the gifted identification procedures and/or processes are, the more culturally responsive they are likely to be (Herring 1996; Salazar 2013; Sternberg 2007). Specifically, critical hope, as opposed to hokey hope, encourages a synergistic alignment between gifted philosophies and practices, in which both harmoniously aim for ongoing development of program quality, resources, and networks students are able to successfully, equitably, and inclusively access (Duncan-Andrade 2009). In this critical regard, gifted programming better engages in a sharing, re-visioning, and enlargement of learner narratives while also expanding current understandings of what giftedness is conceptually outside of White,

Western ways of knowing and being (Charaniya 2012; Wells 2021). Ragoonaden and Mueller (2017) describe such a sharing, re-visioning, and enlargement of learner narratives as a culturally responsive framework that recognizes the rich and varied cultural wealth, knowledge, and skills of diverse learners. Such an approach “seeks to develop a philosophical view of [education] that is dedicated to nurturing students’ academic, social, emotional, cultural, psychological, and physiological well-being” (Ragoonaden and Mueller 2017, 23). Thus, critical hope informs recognizing differences, validating cultures, asserting cultural congruence of classroom practices toward increasing student success in school, and pushing back against conventional, Western school structures that tend to exclude the distinctive cultural habitus and cultural capital of many students.

### **IMPLICATIONS AND QUESTIONS FOR FURTHER EXAMINATION**

What happens when diverse ways of conceptualizing giftedness decenter white, Western ways of understanding, informing, and ordering the field of gifted education? Unlike many Western approaches to conceptualizing intelligence that often prioritize a tangible achievement of intelligence, the aim of education in many cultural groups is found in “the value of the effort, the coming to know... rather than the end result” (Cajete 2000, 80-81). Moreover, Westernized positionality toward intelligence and education tends to lean more individualist, with students often “singled-out” for gifted programming; however, non-Western positionalities may emphasize connectedness and community (Cajete 2000). Thus, the intersectionality of positionality, critical hope, and cultural perspectives disrupts the ethnocentric status-quo, advancing the disorienting dilemma critically necessary for transformation and growth within the field of gifted education (Charaniya 2012; Johnson-Bailey 2012). Instead of eliminating K-12 gifted programming entirely (Silverman and Davies 2021), educational policy makers should examine the culturally incongruent philosophical perspectives and philosophies of giftedness (Herring 1996). In pondering this decentering of Westernized approaches to gifted education, the author poses the following possible implications and questions for further examination.

### **IMPLICATIONS FOR FURTHER EXAMINATION**

It is imperative that researchers, practitioners, and stakeholders within the field of gifted education acknowledge the way in which some gifted characteristics may apply to all gifted children, but that drastic, dynamic, and diverse differences in how giftedness manifests may exist within the context of those characteristics (Hartley 1991; Peterson 1999). Moreover, there is a very evident need, in both theory and practice, to consider the cultural dimensions of giftedness (Sternberg 2007), such as the Diné conceptions of giftedness discussed in this paper (Hartley 1991). The concept of giftedness is bound to cultural context (Peterson 1999). Giftedness is manifested in different ways throughout cultural groups; the aptitudes, attributes, and characteristics associated with gifted knowledge are culturally embedded, and cultures differ in the ways of knowing and thinking they recognize and value (Munro 2011). Such cultural dimensions of giftedness differ from many Westernized understandings and thus serve as critical

pointers not only in guiding gifted identification procedures, but in thinking about the overall purpose of gifted programming, which often appeals to predominantly White, middle-class students (Owens et al. 2018).

**TABLE 2**  
*Gifted education identification procedures*

<b>Dehumanizing</b>	<b>Humanizing</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Use a standardized test as a singular marker of giftedness (Wells 2021; Salazar 2013)</li> <li>• Place emphasis on memorization and conformity (Giroux 2010 as cited in Salazar 2013)</li> <li>• Actively put up “gatekeepers” in the way in which tests are constructed, written, and delivered (Wells 2021)</li> <li>• Push a discourse of whiteness (Salazar 2013)</li> <li>• Seek to replace native languages (Salazar 2013)</li> <li>• Support and sustain deficit perspectives (Salazar 2013)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Include “cultural funds of knowledge as resources” in the identification process (Salazar and Fránquiz 2008 as cited in Salazar 2013, 134)</li> <li>• Include student interests, experiences, and emotions as part of the gifted experience—this may look like considering student-work portfolios, artwork, leadership skills, etc., as markers of giftedness (Dale &amp; Hysop-Margison 2010 as cited in Salazar 2013)</li> <li>• Understand that the dualities of giftedness may manifest in positive <i>and</i> negative ways—such as leadership skills (Wells, 2021)</li> <li>• Provide opportunities to demonstrate talent and gifts through the co-construction of knowledge (Salazar 2013)</li> <li>• Honor resistance to the status-quo as a characteristic often evident in gifted eminent individuals (Salazar, 2013)</li> <li>• Acknowledge that giftedness exists on an ongoing, developmental spectrum (Wells 2021)</li> </ul>

Toward developing more culturally responsive, humanizing gifted education practices, researchers should assume a steadfast engagement in community-engaged participatory gifted education research grounded in the context of community partnerships that acknowledge the knowledge, expertise, experiences, and contributions of all members (Steinhauer 2002). Such research not only centers non-Western narratives as valid, but better supports the translation of evidence into practice, produces actionable change, and eliminates disparities affecting both individuals and communities (Steinhauer 2002). Moreover, researchers may also consider how the inclusion of non-traditional data collection may reveal important, meaningful information toward decolonizing Western ways of seeing and understanding anti-oppressive education (Battiste 2013). For instance, Indigenous methods of data collection, to be included as Indigenous participants see fit, may offer extensive “textual and structural descriptions of experiences (Creswell and Poth 2018, 79; Steinhauer 2002, 79).

## QUESTIONS FOR FURTHER EXAMINATION

In alignment with the nature of this paper, the author poses the following questions for further examination: How do non-Western ways of knowing, being, and doing recognize giftedness? How might such non-Western ways of knowing, being, and doing inform the design of gifted K-12 programming and services? How might non-Western ways of knowing, being, and doing inform Western understandings of giftedness? What role does reciprocity and the co-construction of knowledge play in establishing humanizing, critical positions in understanding giftedness? What kind of asset-based auditing approach(es) might such researchers, practitioners, and stakeholders use toward continual work in decolonizing attitudes toward gifted education? What role do educator preparation programs play in ensuring K-12 educators understand the impact of value orientations in the identification and selection for gifted programs; for creative approaches to affirming culturally valued gifts and talents in the classroom and in special programs; for employing teaching strategies that accommodate the cultural values of nonmainstream, and often systematically excluded, students; for involving community in the identification and selection process (Peterson 1999)? What role might *the pedagogy of listening* (Rinaldi 2001) play in understanding culturally responsive gifted identification practices?

## CONCLUDING THOUGHTS

It is through socio-cultural context that the phenomenon of giftedness is recognized, acknowledged, defined, and nurtured (Ngara 2006). The practice of true diversity, equity, and inclusion requires vigilant awareness of the work that must be continually done to undermine the colonized socialization that leads society to behave in ways that perpetuate the domination of Western cultural heritage, history, values, language, and beliefs (Battiste, 2013; hooks 2003; Owens et al. 2018). Placing attention on Diné (Navajo) conceptions of giftedness, this paper briefly explored what positions and perspectives inform gifted education and which positions and perspectives are left out, thus positing that K-12 gifted programming identification procedures often epitomize a unique and dangerous hidden curriculum founded on Westernized narratives. Drawing from theory on positionality and critical hope, two tables were presented; one to examine hokey versus critical gifted programming practices, and one to examine dehumanizing versus humanizing gifted identification procedures. To avoid gifted identification procedures that epitomize a hidden curriculum, gifted education should honor the cultural dimensions of giftedness and talent, in which identification and programming supports diverse ways of knowing, understanding, and being as valuable and worthwhile. Moreover, in concert with the inclusion of more culturally responsive conceptualizations of giftedness, the field of gifted education might also advocate for the examination of existing programs in both concept and theory, rather than focusing on simply refining methods for identifying students for existing programs (Hodges et al. 2018; Peterson 1999). However, the reader is left with one last question to ponder—is the concept of *giftedness* in-and-of-itself emblematic of White, Western ways of knowing and being?

**CONTRIBUTOR:**

**Vicki Boley** is an Assistant Professor of Education at Colorado State University-Pueblo. She is also a PhD candidate of Curriculum and Instruction specializing in Gifted Education at the University of Denver. Vicki holds a MEd in Culturally and Linguistically Diverse (CLD) education and is currently completing her Gifted Director K-12 license. Prior, Vicki taught 8th grade Spanish and Human Rights Enrichment for a decade in Pueblo West, Colorado.

**Orcid ID:**

Vicki Boley, <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-6911-9040>

**CONTACT:**

Vicki Boley, [vicki.boleyn@csupueblo.edu](mailto:vicki.boleyn@csupueblo.edu)

**REFERENCE LIST**

- Battiste, Marie. 2013. *Decolonizing Education: Nourishing the Learning Spirit*. Saskatoon: Purich.
- Brookwood, Marilyn. 2016. "Eugenics, Lewis Terman, and Tests of Intelligence: One Hundred Years and Counting" [Unpublished manuscript]. *Mind Brain and Education Program, Harvard University*:1-4.
- Cajete, Gregory. 2000. *Native Science*. Santa Fe: Clear Light Publishers.
- Charaniya, Nadira. 2012. "Cultural-Spiritual Perspective of Transformative Learning. In *The Handbook of Transformative Learning: Theory, Research, and Practice*, edited by Edward Taylor & Patricia Cranton, 231-244. Jossey-Bass.
- Creswell, John and Cheryl Poth. 2018. *Qualitative Inquiry Research Design: Choosing Among Five Approaches* (4th ed.). Los Angeles: SAGE Publications.
- Cross, Tracy. 2021. "Keynote Discussants." Discussion presented at the 2021 Gifted Education Policy Symposium and Conference, Denver, CO, February.
- Dai, David. 2021. "Exploring New Conceptions of Giftedness and Talent Development." Conference presentation presented at the National Association for Gifted Children 2021 68th Annual Convention, Denver, CO, November.
- Delisle, Jim and Judy Galbraith. 2015. *When Gifted kids Don't Have All the Answers: How to Meet Their Social and Emotional Needs* (2nd ed.). Minneapolis: Free Spirit Publishing.
- Dewey, John. 1916/1944. *Democracy and Education: An Introduction to The Philosophy of Education*. New York: The Free Press.
- Duncan-Andrade, Jeffrey. 2009. "Note to Educators: Hope Required When Growing Roses in Concrete." *Harvard Educational Review* 79, no. 2: 181-194.
- Ford, Donna and Tarek Grantham. 2003. "Providing Access for Culturally Diverse Gifted Students: From Deficit to Dynamic Thinking." *Theory into Practice* 42, no. 3: 217-225.

- Gentry, Marcia and Matthew Fugate. 2012. "Gifted Native American Students: Underperforming, Under-identified, and Overlooked." *Psychology in the Schools* 49, no. 7: 631-646.
- Hammond, Zaretta. 2015. *Culturally Responsive Teaching and The Brain: Promoting Authentic Engagement and Rigor Among Culturally and Linguistically Diverse Students*. Thousand Oaks: Corwin.
- Hartley, Elizabeth. 1991. "Through Navajo Eyes: Examining Differences in Giftedness." *Journal of American Indian Education* 3, no. 1: 52-64.
- Herring, Roger. 1996. "The Unrecognized Gifted: A More Humanistic Perspective for Indigenous Students." *Journal of Humanistic Education and Development* 35, no. 1: 4-8.
- Hodges, Jaret, Juliana Tay, Yukiko Maeda and Marcia Gentry. 2018. "A Meta-Analysis of Gifted and Talented Identification Practices." *Gifted Children Quarterly* 62:147-174.
- hooks, bell. 2003. *Teaching Community: A Pedagogy of Hope*. New York: Routledge.
- Johnson-Bailey, Juanita. 2012. "Positionality and Transformative Learning: A Tale of Inclusion and Exclusion." In *The Handbook of Transformative Learning: Theory, Research, and Practice*, edited by Edward Taylor & Patricia Cranton, 260-382. Jossey-Bass.
- Lara, Kishan. D. 2009. "Conceptions of Giftedness on the Hoopa Valley Indian Reservation." PhD diss. Arizona State University.
- Munro, John. 2011. "Identifying Gifted Knowledge and Learning in Indigenous Cultures: Africa and Australia." In *Giftedness from an Indigenous Perspective*, edited by Wilma Vialle, 24-35. Australian Association for the Education of the Gifted and Talented. Wollongong Printery.
- Ngara, Constantine. 2006. "Indigenous Conceptions of Giftedness in Zimbabwe: A Comparison of Shona and Ndebele Cultures' Conceptions of Giftedness." *International Education* 36, no. 1: 46-62.
- Owens, Delila, Tanya Middleton, Marie Rosemond and Maryann Meniru. 2018. "Underrepresentation of Black children in Gifted Education Programs: Examining Ethnocentric Monoculturalism." In *Curriculum Development for Gifted Education Programs*, edited by Jessica Cannaday, 135-149. Hershey: IGI Global.
- Peterson, Jean. 1999. "Gifted – Through Whose Cultural Lens? An Application of the Postpositivistic Mode of Inquiry." *Journal for the Education of the Gifted* 22, no. 4: 354-383.
- Ragoonaden, Karen and Lyle Mueller. 2017. "Culturally Responsive Pedagogy: Indigenizing Curriculum." *Canadian Journal of Higher Education* 47, no. 2: 22-46.
- Rinaldi, Carlina. 2001. "The pedagogy of listening: The listening perspective from Reggio Emilia." *Innovations in Early Education: The International Reggio Exchange* 8, no. 4: 1-4.
- Rinn, Anne, Rachel Mun and Jaret Hodges. "2018-2019 State of the states in gifted education." *National Association for Gifted Children and the Council of State Directors of Programs for the Gifted*. Last modified March 19, 2020. <https://www.nagc.org/2018-2019-state-states-gifted-education>.

- Salazar, Maria. 2013. "A Humanizing Pedagogy: Reinventing the Principles and Practice of Education as Journey Toward Liberation." *Review of Research in Education* 37, no. 1: 121-148.
- Silverman, Linda and Joy Davis. 2021. "Eliminating Gifted Programs Increases Inequity." Conference presentation at the 2021 National Association for Gifted Children 68<sup>th</sup> Annual Convention, Denver, CO, November.
- Sousa, David. 2009. *How the gifted brain learns*. Thousand Oaks: Corwin.
- Steinhauer, Evelyn. 2002. "Thoughts on an indigenous research methodology." *Canadian Journal of Native Education* 26, no. 2: 69-81.
- Sternberg, Robert. 2007. "Cultural dimension of giftedness and talent." *Roeper Review* 29, no. 3: 160-165.
- Vaught, Sabrina. 2011. *Racism, Public Schooling, and The Entrenchment of White Supremacy: A Critical Race Ethnography*. Albany: New York Press.
- Wells, April. 2021. "Identification Panel." Conference session presented at the 2021 Gifted Education Policy Symposium and Conference, Denver, CO, February.
- .