

# Responding to the Unique Social and Emotional Learning Needs of Gifted Australian Students

Susen Smith

**Abstract** This chapter presents an overview of the multifaceted characteristics of intellectually gifted students, their social and emotional needs, and ways of scaffolding their social and affective growth for academic engagement from an Australian perspective. Generally, gifted students experience and respond to external influences quite differently to many of their same-age peers of average ability due to their asynchronous chronological and intellectual development and their social and emotional complexities. This asynchrony has implications for their social interactions, social and emotional learning (SEL) needs, programming, and provisions. Research reiterates that their unique characteristics require accurate identification and supportive educational provisions to enable the holistic development of their intellectual, social, and emotional growth. Recognising the unique characteristics and needs of gifted students and helping them to extend their skills to develop SEL competencies are preludes to enhancing their academic achievement, while consecutively promoting their personal well-being and healthy relationships.

**Keywords** Social and emotional learning · Intellectually gifted students · Holistic needs · Supportive strategies · Healthy relationships · Well-being

## 1 Introduction

In the gifted education field, the socio-emotional characteristics and needs of gifted learners, sociocultural diversity, multi-exceptionalities, and ambiguity in provisions are key areas in current Australian research, discourse, and practice that are relevant to social and emotional learning (SEL) (Gross 2010; Kronborg and Plunkett 2013; Lassig 2009; Long et al. 2015; Townend et al. 2014). There is a body of research on the socio-emotional characteristics of diversely gifted students (e.g. see Gross 2010; Hoekman et al. 2005; Vialle 2012); however, empirical research on provisional

---

S. Smith (✉)

GERRIC, School of Education, University of New South Wales, Sydney, Australia  
e-mail: susen.smith@unsw.edu.au

effectiveness for supporting the socio-emotional growth of gifted students is weaker (Wiley and Hébert 2014). While over a century of wide-ranging research indicates gifted children can have advanced socio-emotional development commensurate with their advanced intelligence, many environmental and psychosocial influences can inhibit or promote their well-being and healthy relationships (Peterson 2009). Specifically, the concern here is with the SEL of intellectually gifted students (IGS).

In this chapter SEL will be discussed through the lens of the Collaborative for Social, Academic, and Emotional Learning (CASEL 2013, 2015) framework. Accordingly, a SEL programme engages students in constructive interactions, meaningful activities, and challenging learning tasks, using collaborative in-class and community interrelationships to support students' positive social and emotional growth (CASEL 2015). SEL focuses on helping students to use and extend their knowledge, understandings, and skills to develop five competencies: self-awareness (to understand their emotions), self-management (to self-regulate their emotions and behaviours), social awareness (to empathetically understand others), relationship skills (to engage in positive relationships), and responsible decision-making (to make constructive choices) (CASEL 2013, 2015). Of note, a number of state education policies and the Australian Curriculum Assessment and Reporting Authority (ACARA 2015, 2016) adhere to the CASEL definition of SEL in their focus on students' social and emotional development.

With respect to conceptions of giftedness, most Australian educational policies use Gagné's (2010) Differentiated Model of Giftedness and Talent (DMGT). Gagné (2010) theorises that a gifted child is in the top 10% of the population and has superior untrained natural abilities within one or more human ability domains or potentialities that include: intellectual, creative, social/affective, and sensorimotor. Talent, however, needs effort, practice, consistent support, and systematic development to achieve excellence and possibly eminence. Accurate identification of psychosocial needs, along with educational support, influences the talent development trajectory. Underachievement remains until talent evolves.

Despite diversity in giftedness, many shared characteristics are evident in gifted children. For example, due to their asynchronous chronological and intellectual development, combined with their emotional intensities, many gifted students may experience and respond to external influences quite differently to others, particularly their same-age average ability peers (e.g. see decades of work by Gross 2010). As such, emotional dissonance and social vulnerabilities can result in particular characteristics, such as resilience, buoyancy, positive self-concept, motivation, volition, self-management, self-awareness, or confidence, are not present (Gagné 2010; Shechtman and Silektor 2012). While non-gifted students may share these characteristics, a combination of these characteristics are needed by IGS to support them through difficulties they may encounter that can impede talent development (Gagné 2010). For instance, many gifted students can become quite anxious about their asynchronous experiences and express their feelings in ways that might be misinterpreted as emotional immaturity instead of emotional confusion or intensity, especially profoundly intellectually gifted children (Gross 2010). This has implications for their social relationships, as well as their SEL needs, programming, and

provisions. Therefore, it is pertinent to recognise the complex interplay between characteristics, issues, and influences that contribute to the unique individual needs of gifted students in order to promote their personal well-being and healthy relationships.

As noted above, this chapter focuses on the experiences of IGS. Specifically, an overview of the multifaceted characteristics of IGS, their social and emotional needs, how they learn social and emotional skills, and ways of scaffolding their social and affective growth for academic engagement are presented. Implications for practitioners and future directions are also discussed.

## **2 The Unique Experiences and Needs of Intellectually Gifted Students (IGS)**

Research on the cognitive and affective development of gifted students illustrates how IGS are unique from same-age average ability students in several ways (Clark 2013; Gross 2010). Depending on their age, and type or degree of giftedness, IGS may have a multitude of diverse characteristics that are specific to their expertise. They may exhibit cognitive characteristics, such as high inquisitiveness, advanced verbal skills, fast abstract processing, unconventional recognition of conceptual interrelationships, an intricately organised knowledge base, more efficient memory, and rapid learning (Clark 2013). They may display contrasting non-intellective social characteristics, such as being self-confident but perfectionistic, having high expectations of self and others, being cooperative but also dominant over others, recognising social difficulties and providing solutions, but at the same time questioning authority (Clark 2013). These different cognitive and social characteristics may influence emotional outcomes. For example, IGS's cognitive complexity engenders abstract thinking that can heighten emotional responses (Gross 2010). While emotional intensity can be the motivation for self-actualisation and achievement for many IGS (Jarvis 2013; Piechowski 2008), they may need to develop strategies for coping with unusually deep, intense, and multiple emotions, high sensitivity to others' needs, and an advanced sense of justice with high moral reasoning (Clark 2013). If effectively nurtured, this blend of characteristics can enable the emergence of talent.

IGS may differ from non-gifted students in other ways too. For example, Vialle et al.'s (2007) longitudinal study indicated that IGS's academic achievements were greater than their non-gifted peers, but the gifted felt sad, dissatisfied with social support, and misunderstood, despite their teachers rating IGS as more well adjusted and more well behaved, with less emotional problems than their same-age peers. Conversely, IGS's capacities can be developed productively or used less gainfully if they are not nurtured appropriately. For instance, Wolf and Chessor's (2011) research found that bullying was a social stressor in an unsupportive environment that can diminish IGS's affective experiences, such as self-concept, motivation,

and social coping. Anti-social behaviour, such as bullying, is a twofold issue for IGS, as studies show that they are likely to be intimidated, victimised, or bullied, while others show IGS as being bullies (O'Neill et al. 2014; Wolf and Chessor 2011; Vialle et al. 2007).

Perfectionism can also impact academic, social, and emotional growth, as perfectionism can be either positive or negative. Vialle et al. (2007) found that high-achieving students were conscientious, were hopeful, and held positive attitudes to school, while those who underachieved were not. Healthy perfectionists are usually highly motivated and use this trait to achieve their goals. However, dysfunctional perfectionism can inhibit progress. Disorganisation, anxiety, stress, and underachievement can result when dysfunctional perfectionists fail to meet their own high ideals and exceptionality (Blaas 2014; Bond 2013). Interventions such as counselling may address these concerns.

While a gifted child may well have a disability too, the characteristics of IGS without a disability still reveal remarkable similarities with children with disorders. Students with autism, attention deficit hyperactivity disorder (ADHD), bipolar, or behavioural disorders display traits so similar that a gifted child can be mistaken for having pathologies (Webb 2013; Webb et al. 2005). For example, students with autism and gifted students may lack attention or communication skills, have intense interests, or have difficulty forming relationships (Webb et al. 2005). With similarities between characteristics, harmful misdiagnoses can result (Webb et al. 2005). It is not the individual characteristics, but how they are collectively exhibited over time, how they influence their well-being, and how they are comprehensively identified and addressed in various contexts. Thus, it is germane to raise practitioners' awareness of these analogous characteristics and provide accurate identification of IGS in order to plan for their individual educational needs.

Less advantaged groups may have additional SEL needs, such as some gifted Aboriginal or Torres Strait Islanders, particular students with twice or multi-exceptionalities, or some gifted children from low socio-economic backgrounds or diverse cultural contexts where English is an additional language (Jarvis 2013; Vialle 2012; Wormald and Vialle 2011). For instance, students who have twice exceptionalities may have both superior cognitive capacities and learning disabilities (Wormald et al. 2014). Because of their unique combination of strengths and weaknesses, students who have multiple exceptionalities may develop social and emotional difficulties. For example, research has indicated that students who have twice exceptionalities may be more prone to having lower self-concept, which foregrounds cognitive processing difficulties and psychosocial problems (Townend et al. 2014). Psychosocial issues might cause frustration, demotivation, inappropriate behaviours, fear of failure, poor interrelationships, negative school attitudes, or lack of belonging. Conversely, students who have multi-exceptionalities can have many constructive characteristics, such as being creative, imaginative, insightful, having advanced ideas and questioning, problem solving well, being passionate if interested, being socially adjusted, and having a sophisticated sense of humour (Wormald and Vialle 2011). While they can use these strengths to bolster their self-esteem, for example by using humour sarcastically, their constructive

characteristics can be used to overcome adverse experiences (Gross 2010). Ultimately though, one of their exceptionalities may remain undiagnosed. As such, a substantial proportion of their needs may be overlooked, which will likely detrimentally influence their social and emotional development. Hence, early identification and intervention to facilitate the socio-emotional growth of students with multi-exceptionalities is apposite.

The unique cognitive characteristics of IGS are so dynamically intertwined with their emotional and social traits that addressing only the cognitive attributes may result in social exclusion and underachievement (Blaas 2014). Thus, IGS require holistic educational provisions that link cognitive and affective developmental needs (Assouline et al. 2015; Gross 2010; Vialle and Rogers 2012). Collectively, this section provided an overview of some of the unique social and emotional characteristics of IGS and associated issues. The close association between heightened intellectual capacity and emotional sensitivities was highlighted, along with the possibilities of misdiagnoses. The need to collectively address intellectual, social, and emotional needs of IGS during provisions was also reinforced.

### **3 Do Current SEL Programmes Support the Holistic Needs of Gifted Students?**

There are a number of current SEL programmes in Australia, but little is known about whether these consider gifted students' needs. Thus, a brief overview of Australian SEL programmes that have the potential to meet the needs of gifted students is provided below. Foremost, there are whole-school CASEL-matched SEL programmes like the 'KidsMatter' programme (AGDH 2010) or the 'Social Skills Improvement System CIP' (SSIS-CIP; Durlak et al. 2015). These programmes are considered comprehensive and systematic, but flexible (Stafford et al. 2007), and fill needs-based gaps in schools' curricula, professional learning, and resources (Humphrey 2013). Importantly, evaluations have found these programmes are 'agents of change' promoting SEL, well-being, and resiliency for all students, but not necessarily for gifted students (Stafford et al. 2007). Next, there are specific programmes that include some needs of gifted students, for example, the PATHS curriculum (AGDH 2010), and the 'Primary Extension and Challenge' (PEAC) programme (Western Australia Department of Education 2011). While these have multiple delivery modes and address intellectual rigour combined with identified SEL needs of IGS, these are part-time withdrawal programmes and not a regular part of the whole-school curriculum.

Additionally, community-based consultancy programmes, like the Australian Gifted Support Centre's (2014) 'Stepping Stones Course', target many SEL needs of IGS. This programme supports skill development, such as anger management, emotional regulation, or friendship/relationship skills. However, the programme only focuses on SEL needs and not the holistic needs of the gifted child. Furthermore, a

broad range of extra-curricular enrichment competitions overlap school and community, such as Science Fairs, ‘Tournament of Minds’, ‘World Scholars’ Cup’, and the ‘Future Problem Solving’ programme (Eyre 2016; Ozturk and Debelak 2008; Smith 2015). These programmes can challenge IGS and nurture their cognitive, social, and emotional well-being holistically and collaboratively (Jarvis 2013; Kronborg and Plunkett 2013). Despite these SEL-relevant curriculums, many of these programmes (and other similar programmes) are yet to be evaluated.

In summary, it appears that current Australian SEL programmes for IGS are fragmentary ‘add-on’ withdrawal classes or community-based programmes, or are structured to serve all students, rather than creating responses specifically directed towards the holistic needs of IGS.

## 4 Strategies for Developing SEL Competencies Among IGS

Gifted education research has reiterated that gifted students require qualitatively different educational opportunities to address their holistic needs and achieve their potential (Gross 2010; Henderson 2007). Policies on gifted education around Australia stipulate the need to support the social and emotional development of IGS (e.g. DECD 2016). They reinforce that specific strategies are needed for IGS to link their academic, social, and emotional needs (Long et al. 2015; Vialle 2012). The research supports embedding explicit skill development within the school curriculum, so specific programming of SEL can alleviate many of the concerns that arise for IGS (VanTassel-Baska and Stambaugh 2006; Stafford et al. 2007). This section provides ways of scaffolding SEL of IGS to support academic engagement, achievement, and well-being, based around the five interrelated cognitive, social, and emotional competencies: self-awareness, self-management, social awareness, relationship skills, and responsible decision-making (CASEL 2007, 2013, 2015). Effective goal setting, resiliency (i.e. the ability to navigate major academic setbacks such as suspension, subject failure; Martin and Marsh 2008), buoyancy (i.e. the ability to navigate everyday academic setbacks; e.g. a poor mark, competing deadlines; Martin and Marsh 2008), motivation, self-concept, and self-regulation to promote the reversal of underachievement to achievement will also be elaborated (Gross 2010).

**Self-awareness** This first SEL competence refers to developing understanding of one’s emotions, values, strengths, limitations, and challenges (CASEL 2013). Many IGS are aware they are gifted, but do not really understand what giftedness is or its ramifications (Galbraith and Delisle 2011). Thus, teaching students to know themselves, their capabilities, strengths, and possibilities for learning is essential (Cross 2005). Projects on ‘exploring giftedness’ may assist the gifted child to understand why they feel different to many of their chronological and average-ability peers. Terry (2008) reinforced the value of problem-based service learning to engage IGS in community passion projects. These address their interests and abstract thinking

processes, increase their responsibility, and support their self-awareness, empathy, and reflective judgment. Passion projects produce opportunities for empathetic expression and compassion for altruistic outcomes (Cash 2011).

IGS have heightened awareness of differences between themselves and their more typical peers (Shechtman and Silektor 2012), but may not know enough to handle possible difficulties (Galbraith and Delisle 2011). Recent research in gifted education has reinforced the importance of student voice (Chandra Handa 2009; Terry 2008), so encouraging students to identify their own SEL limitations and needs expedites self-advocacy (Cross 2005). Opportunities to discuss their SEL needs allow IGS an outlet for their feelings, and, if this can be increased to dialogue that engenders empathy between the discussants (e.g. Socratic dialogue), then deeper analysis of key issues and values can be addressed to support empathic development (Harper 2013; Maker and Schiever 2010). Through facilitated dialogue, bibliotherapy allows gifted students to connect their own personal concerns with those emulated by literary characters. Bibliotherapy can enable IGS to understand the complex interplay between their characteristics, strengths, emotional concerns, moral decision-making, and behavioural outcomes (Prykaza 2013). Moreover, bibliotherapy assists with reducing anxiety and isolation, while increasing self-efficacy, resiliency, emotional self-regulation, and achievement (McCullis and Chamberlain 2013). Journaling also supports cognitive processing when writing about feelings and challenges (Cross 2005). IGS can use creative self-expression in dance or drama performance or other artistic productions to explore their own and others' emotions, while identifying defence systems can support emotional well-being (Bencik-Kangal and Ari 2013; Mueller 2009).

**Self-management** This refers to self-regulating emotions and behaviours by managing stress, increasing motivation, and learning goal setting (CASEL 2013). VanTassel-Baska and Stambaugh (2006) espouse an affective curriculum for IGS that motivates academic, social, and emotional development. They advise proactively planning logical thinking strategies, information processing, comprehensive assessment, philosophical discussions, and variety in products and outcomes in project-based learning to explore topics of interest, emotions, values, key concepts, and attitudes. Consideration needs to be given to teaching IGS self-regulation skills to design and implement projects successfully and complete assignments effectively (Cash 2011).

An important element of self-regulation involves identifying and setting goals (Martin 2012). According to Martin (2012), using intrinsic motivation for setting realistic short-term goals for both effort and excellence can be supported through developing individual contracts with students. In addition, self-designed projects based on interests, choice, and well-designed goals can nurture self-motivation and support stress management. Role models, mentors, or biographies can be used to explore life experiences, personal struggles, goal setting, and how achievement occurred through effort (Smith and Laura 2009; Martin 2012). Of note, consistent practice with increasingly challenging goals is essential for IGS's SEL to assist buoyancy development (Gross 2010; Martin 2012).

IGS need to be challenged to manage more advanced academic tasks, while developing the resiliency and buoyancy needed to self-manage emotions within learning processes (Eddles-Hirsch et al. 2010). For example, orbital studies allow students to self-direct their own learning, and develop research skills, while reducing organisational stressors (Tomlinson 2014). A recent study (North et al. 2015) elaborated the stressors associated with high pressure testing and concluded that group-based pastoral care programmes would enable IGS to understand and deal with their affective distress in response to academic pressure, competition, increased workload, and procrastination. For IGS, strategies to overcome emotional distress and diffuse stressors include: setting realistic goals; using diaries to meet deadlines; using consistent feedback to finish tasks; teaching time-management; and providing counselling to assist transitions to healthy perfectionism (Bond 2013; Galbraith and Delisle 2011; Greenspoon 2013). However, it is the collective use of strategies that needs consideration, for instance, challenging work combined with realistic expectations assists IGS awareness of self-imposed stressors (Christopher and Shewmaker 2010).

Presenting outcomes to authentic audiences encourages students to take risks, supports intrinsic motivation, and helps them to celebrate their success as they receive praise (Inman and Kirchner 2016). Taking risks helps in overcoming fear of failure and can lead to academic achievement (Gross 2010). However, IGS may have unhealthy perfectionist traits such as procrastinating, having difficulty making decisions, rejecting challenges if they lack buoyancy, not accepting mistakes, being dissatisfied with outcomes if they do not meet their own stringent expectations, being self-critical and critical of others, expressing frustrations inappropriately, being highly competitive, or having difficult relationships due to high expectations of peers (Bond 2013). Thus, it is important to provide support to minimise these experiences. For example, learning positive perfectionism traits balances these negativities and is exhibited in acceptance of both strengths and weaknesses and being able to manage behaviours. Self-monitoring their own progress helps students to develop positive perfectionism (Christopher and Shewmaker 2010). A safe classroom environment provides opportunities for healthy challenges to reduce frustrations, and for taking small risks and building up to larger risks (Landis and Reschley 2013). After risk-taking incidents, acknowledging positive outcomes or identifying relevant personal goals to work towards assists self-management (Bond 2013).

Another way self-management can be promoted among IGS is through positive personal best (PB) goals, which involves setting goals to meet or exceed a previous best performance or effort (Martin 2012). PB goal setting enables students to make learning choices, is intrinsically motivating, and reduces internal emotional conflicts (Martin 2012). PB goals may help IGS to develop self-control in decision-making, self-regulatory processes, skills in monitoring emotions, self-efficacy, higher expectations, and greater achievement and well-being (Morisano and Shore 2010). Some additional recommended strategies are as follows:

- scaffolding students through academically and psychologically enriching learning processes encourages outcomes satisfaction;

- nurturing links with specific neuropsychological functioning/signals using supports such as ‘think alouds’, graphic organisers, visuals, imagery, mnemonics, acronyms, analogies, or metaphors facilitates complex cognitive processing and behaviours towards appropriate outcomes/success;
- training mentors supports goal development based on extra-curricular student interests to enhance self-concept, self-efficacy, and self-regulation skills;
- reducing anxiety by providing learning choices and focusing on intrinsically motivated tasks with small step/proximal goals fosters efficiency/step-by-step achievement which builds resiliency/buoyancy to meet challenges and reduces underachievement;
- applying growth mindsets strategies for talent development, such as teaching that challenges are opportunities for growth, providing cooperative learning tasks to develop choice and self-responsibility, modelling mistakes and how to overcome them, providing consistent practice, and self-evaluation opportunities (Chandra Handa 2009; Dweck 2006; Gallagher and Smith 2013; Garn and Jolly 2014; Martin 2012; Morisano and Shore 2010).

**Social awareness** This refers to building understandings of others, expressing empathy, acknowledging ethical norms, and recognising supportive resources (CASEL 2013). Gifted children may have a different quality of emotional experience than non-gifted children (Piechowski 2008) and the more advanced the intellect, the greater the emotional intensity (Gross 2010). This emotional intensity is nurtured by strong affective memory and deep thought processes that are reflected in their advanced responses, such as showing extreme emotions, having complex interrelationships, asking provocative questions, restlessness, or feeling heightened fear or anxiety (Harper 2013; Piechowski 2008).

This intensity means IGS may have a greater capacity to feel more empathetic towards others (e.g. Harper 2013; Piechowski 2008; Shechtman and Silektor 2012). Hence, most IGS show concern for others and respond sensitively to other’s needs (Gross 2010). These feelings can motivate self-actualisation, advanced cognitive functioning, and their affective capacity for conceptualising problems, which can translate into solutions to society’s injustices (Smith and Laura 2009). However, this emotional intensity is often confused with behaviour disorders or learning difficulties and reflected in misdiagnoses mentioned earlier (Webb et al. 2005). Emotional intensity can also engender heightened curiosity, vivid fantasies, self-criticism, and having problems adapting to change which can result in lack of self-confidence, inappropriate behaviours, or misguided social exchanges (Piechowski 2008; Shechtman and Silektor 2012; Smith and Laura 2009).

Taken together, therefore, IGS have unique social awareness needs. One strategy for responding to these includes providing meaningful involvement in solving personal issues or real social problems through grouped concept-based learning—to use deeper complex thinking to develop awareness of multifaceted interrelationships between conceptual ideas, issues, concerns, and interests while practising their problem solving skills concurrently (Cash 2011; Chandra Handa 2009; Maker and Schiever 2010).

Paradoxically, social awareness of IGS can appear to be at extremes, from their capacity to empathise with others' perspectives, to having difficulties relating to same-age peers or exhibiting socially inappropriate behaviours (Harper 2013). These dichotomies between characteristics, behaviours, and negative and positive outcomes can be addressed sensitively by educators and families alike in developmentally appropriate learning environments (Chandra Handa 2009; Eddles-Hirsch et al. 2010; Hoekman et al. 2005; Laura and Smith 2009).

If IGS lack a sense of justice or morality or the opportunity to use their leadership skills constructively during their development, there may be negative consequences, for example gang leadership, disruptive behaviours, dropping out, delinquency, criminal behaviour, or juvenile detention (Roepner and Silverman 2009). Hence, linking moral development with teaching understandings of various leadership processes and practising leadership skills in varying contexts may enhance favourable leadership attributes (Roepner and Silverman 2009). Students would benefit from working in a variety of grouping contexts to reinforce leadership and teamwork skills consecutively (Ozturk and Debelak 2008). Modelling leadership, tolerance, and problem solving can scaffold how IGS could use their unique characteristics more appropriately and ethically (VanTassel-Baska and Stambaugh 2006).

Eddles-Hirsch et al.'s (2010) research indicated that schools that provide a range of formal SEL programmes and foster systematic SEL options result in positive social environments, a sense of community through extra-curricular provisions, more effective peer relationships, and academic achievement rather than maladjusted coping strategies. Hoekman et al. (2005) recommend using empowering social networks to provide challenging tasks for authentic audiences with meaningful outcomes to enable the twin goals of academic and personal growth.

**Relationship skills** This refers to engaging in positive relationship building with constructive communication, collaboration, and negotiated conflict (CASEL 2013). Neuroscience research illustrates that interrelationships between emotions and intellect have profound effects on IGS who may be more emotionally aware than same-age peers (Geake 2009). Research also reinforces the importance of high-quality relationships for supporting resilience development (Luthar 2006). For these reasons, IGS need to develop resiliency to deal with the depth of their emotions in relationships (Geake 2009). Luthar (2006) suggests some strategies for scaffolding resiliency: modelling messages; positive self-talk; using adversity to lead to positive outcomes; practising using internal and external emotional experiences; communicating resiliency attitudes; and nurturing social relationships through role-play and social skills programmes.

IGS's unique personal circumstances need to be considered to help them develop high-quality relationship skills. With intellectual capacities far beyond their chronological age, intrapersonal asynchrony arises. This means that the emotional maturity of IGS is usually beyond their same-age peers, but below their own intellectuality (Fraser-Seeto et al. 2015; Plunkett and Kronborg 2011). Moreover, when intellectual development far exceeds same-age peers, social interactions may

become difficult, so IGS need relationships with older peers of similar intellectual capacity to help meet their holistic needs (Gross 2010).

While the search for like-minded friends begins early in gifted children, finding friends who appreciate their advanced perceptions or understand their sensitivities is difficult (Gross 2010). Friendships become more sophisticated and complex the more intellectually gifted the students are and the older they become (Gross 2010). Difficulties in relating to same-age peers can be mistaken for social immaturity, when instead IGS need to be with older peers for socio-emotional satisfaction. Lack of social congruence with same-age peers can lead to pathological outcomes, such as loneliness, social isolation, depression, internalising anxiety or stress, low self-esteem, or perfectionism (Gross 2010; Mueller 2009). Hence, there is the need to be mindful of these possible difficulties for IGS.

Gifted students often need to balance the choice between friendships and achievement (Gross 2010). The well-being, self-esteem, and friendships of gifted and talented learners could be improved if they are scaffolded to interact with like-interested peers in extra-curricular opportunities. Small group role-playing can be used to explore competitive social issues as they arise (Bond 2013). Subject or grade acceleration can contribute to talent development by providing intellectual challenge, friendship-building opportunities, and remediating social difficulties to enable interaction with cognitively, socially, and emotionally equal peers (Assouline et al. 2015; Dare et al. 2016; Maher and Geeves 2014). Conversely, societal attitudes and misconceptions can inhibit acceleration based on concerns for IGS's social and emotional development, so acceleration is less frequently employed than it could be in Australia (Dare et al. 2016; Gallagher and Smith 2013; Long et al. 2015). Deleterious outcomes, such as emotional distress or social disengagement, can occur if gifted students remain in inappropriate learning environments with curriculum or instruction that are poorly matched to their individual needs (Gross 2010; North et al. 2015; Plunkett and Kronborg 2007). Therefore, IGS need accelerated provisions to reduce the risk of disengagement, underachievement, or developing socio-emotional or behavioural problems (Blaas 2014; Gross 2010; Maher and Geeves 2014). However, it is differentiated instruction combined with social acceptance within the accelerated context that will be most beneficial for IGS's socio-emotional development (Assouline et al. 2015; Chandra Handa 2009; Jung et al. 2011).

**Responsible decision-making** This final SEL competence refers to constructively making ethical, personal, social, and safe choices for collective well-being (CASEL 2013). IGS differentiate from many of their same-age average-learning peers in their exceptional, insightful, and efficient use of creative thinking processes for acquiring new knowledge or solving problems innovatively and quickly (Sternberg 2012). More recent Australian research asserts that IGS have superior metacognitive processing skills (Bannister-Tyrrell et al. 2014). Advanced metacognitive processes can make decision-making easier, more efficient, and more strategic for the gifted than non-gifted, and IGS are able to monitor their decision-making processes and amend strategies to achieve more positive outcomes (Ball et al. 1994).

At the same time, this metacognitive advantage suggests that decision-making for the gifted also has motivational, social, or emotional ramifications. Indeed, those who are most influential in their lives can moderate decision-making for IGS. For example, combined with their metacognitive awareness, moral characteristics, and ethical considerations, IGS generally make considered choices and responsible decisions that are respectful of their peers. Many IGS creatively express myriad intellectual and social and emotional energies with sophisticated moral and ethical responses (Piechowski 2008). IGS can express their moral concerns at a younger age and their moral promise increases the higher the intellect. They are, therefore, considered to have heightened moral sensitivities. Generally, IGS use higher levels of prosocial moral reasoning and empathy than their typical same-age peers (Hay et al. 2007). Their moral obligations are founded on advanced intellect, emotional intensity, sensitivity, and empathy combined.

Sternberg (2012) reinforced teaching moral reasoning processes, ethical thinking, and decision-making with real-life problem solving. Explicit instruction that rationalises immorality and social injustice assists in teaching moral reasoning skills (Prykaza 2013). A number of programmes can be used to enable IGS to fulfil their potential for high moral reasoning, such as Kohlberg's (Maker and Schiever 2010) discussions of moral dilemmas and creative drama programmes to increase moral judgment (Bencik-Kangal et al. 2013). Folsom's (2011) 'Teaching for Intellectual and Emotional Learning' (TIEL) programme endorses amalgamating teaching critical thinking skills and SEL. Crucially, supporting the gifted child's heightened empathetic and moral awareness should assist them to reach emotional maturity.

## 5 Implications for Practitioners

Further implications to attend to the unique SEL needs of IGS encompass: addressing misconceptions, integrating SEL into whole-school curricula, and fostering collaborative interrelationships (Mueller 2009). Each of these is addressed consecutively.

**Overcoming misconceptions of giftedness** Despite over three decades of Australian Government inquiries, numerous policies and empirical studies highlighting the disadvantage of chronological age classes, attitudes persist against gifted education (Commonwealth of Australia 2001; Eddles-Hirsch et al. 2010; Fraser-Seeto et al. 2015; Gross 2010; Lassig 2009; Vialle 2012; Victorian Government Education and Training Committee 2012). These attitudes tend to focus on preconceived stereotypes of elitism (e.g. IGS do not need support). In turn, these misconceptions likely result in misdiagnoses, thus possibly inhibiting IGS provisions (Gross 2010; Maher and Geeves 2014; Peterson 2009; Vialle 2012).

Australian research highlights the impact of detrimental attitudes towards gifted education because without appropriate provisions, disengagement and underachievement become exponential (Fraser-Seeto et al. 2015; Lassig 2009; McCoach 2007; Rogers 2007; Vialle 2012). Misconceptions of gifted students' needs can

result in unchallenging curriculum, unnecessary content repetition, and lack of support that cultivates psychological distress and behavioural outcomes such as persistent boredom, frustration, and inappropriate behaviours (Geake and Gross 2008; Peterson 2009). Fortunately, more positive attitudes have emerged towards understanding gifted education generally (Lassig 2009), and consistent professional learning can inhibit lingering attitudes that feed misconceptions about giftedness as a prelude to more relevant practices (Geake and Gross 2008; Iizuka et al. 2015; Long et al. 2015; Rowley 2012).

**Integrating SEL for IGS into the whole-school curriculum** Teachers are influential catalysts for supporting talent development (Gagné 2010). Assuredly, scaffolding academic success reduces underachievement, nurturing feelings of belonging protects against depression, and providing multiple pathways in learning promotes achievement (Capern and Hammond 2014; Mueller 2009). Educators' duty of care extends to students who underachieve or disengage (Stafford et al. 2007). One of the earliest signs that indicate students are disengaged is the negative behaviours they exhibit. Assessing students' readiness for learning by linking SEL with characteristics, competencies, and behaviours can highlight their specific needs to be addressed (Stafford et al. 2007). Assessment should be wide-ranging and multidimensional, and could include qualitative processes inclusive of interest inventories, rating scales, anecdotal information, auditions, interviews, observations, cyclic feedback, with quantitative evidence of IGS achievement or lack of achievement (Smith 2015). Another way to inhibit inappropriate behaviours is to change teaching techniques (Kronborg and Plunkett 2013). Specifically, empowering students more within learning processes through provision of choice and collaborative decision-making will engage their interests and inhibit distracting behaviours (Chandra Handa 2009; Eddles-Hirsch et al. 2010; Garn and Jolly 2014).

Integrating SEL into the school curriculum aids IGS (Iizuka et al. 2015). There are a number of strategies that are specific to the IGS needs, inclusive of flexible grouping, curriculum compaction, and self-regulated tasks beyond the curriculum (Eyre 2016). Vialle et al. (2007) recommend social skills education, such as guiding communication, collaboration, and problem solving using various strategies. Some curriculum models can be used to plan meaningful learning activities specific to the individual intellectual characteristics and SEL needs of IGS in classrooms (Chandra Handa 2009; Eyre 2016; Maker and Schiever 2010; Smith 2015). These include various models currently used in Australian schools, but are not limited to: Kaplan's Thematic Model that scaffolds inquiry learning (Kaplan 1993), Williams' Cognitive-Affective Interaction Model with strategies to meet the dual needs of academic and socio-emotional learning (Williams 1993), Maker and Schiever's (2010) DISCOVER Model using problem solving across varying learning preferences, Betts' (2003) Autonomous Learner Model, and Van Tassel-Baska's Affective Curriculum (VanTassel-Baska and Stambaugh 2006). Acceleration is one of the most cost-effective and successful research-based strategies to support the holistic needs of IGS (Assouline et al. 2015). IGS have affirmed that they want challenging extension opportunities for their well-being, such as developing coping

mechanisms, dealing with competition, increasing motivation, and improving peer relationships (Eddles-Hirsch et al. 2010). Generally, whole-school SEL programmes provide secure learning environments and support positive interrelationship building, but for these programmes to be sustainable, supportive school leadership is needed (Eddles-Hirsch et al. 2010; Long et al. 2015).

### **Nurturing collaborative interrelationships to support teachers and students**

Positive interactions between students and others influence academic achievement, learning engagement, and socio-emotional well-being (Eddles-Hirsch et al. 2010). In particular, meaningful teacher–student relationships are foundational for SEL in the school context and promote IGS’s learning engagement to alleviate anxiety about achievement (Eddles-Hirsch et al. 2010). Inherent in fostering productive student–teacher relationships are: showing interest in students; giving students enough time to complete tasks; explaining what is not easily understood; using additional resources beyond the textbook; allowing peer support; problem solving instead of punishing; not discriminating against students; taking jokes; and being respectful and honest (Capern and Hammond 2014, p. 60).

IGS may need counselling to guide them through the struggles they encounter with the dichotomy implicit in their asynchronous development and to overcome socio-emotional difficulties exacerbated by unsuitable placements, programmes, or provisions (Greenspoon 2013). However, IGS receive less counselling support than their peers, which is mainly psychological testing and for behaviour management (Vialle 2012). Counsellors could benefit from specialised professional learning to develop their understandings of IGS’s characteristics and needs to proactively support constructive programmes that integrate SEL strategies. Further implications for counsellors are to apply preventative and intensive interventions to assist students’ to overcome specifics, such as anxiety or stress to assist positive socio-emotional growth and to advocate for IGS (Vialle 2012).

As IGS need a continuum of comprehensive services, the classroom teacher needs to be supported to scaffold students (Smith 2015). Professional learning would support teachers to explore their own socio-emotional needs, the holistic needs of IGS, advocacy, and collaborations for planning for IGS SEL needs (Askill-Williams and Lawson 2013; Kronborg and Plunkett 2013). However, supporting IGS should be a collaborative process between all significant others, where interrelationships can be modelled and guided in various environments that provide external protective barriers for security (North et al. 2015). Coordinated collaborations, both in school and connected to the community, build positive interrelationships between the students, teachers, family, and significant others to support SEL interventions to address the range of experiences needed by IGS (CASEL 2015; Eddles-Hirsch et al. 2010). If stakeholders, such as gifted students, parents, leaders, educators, academics, educational bodies, policy-makers, advocates, or associations, made a commitment to SEL principles, programmes, and strategies, guided by the CASEL (2015) framework, collaborative provisions across classrooms, schools, communities, disciplines, and healthcare services could eventuate for IGS (Eddles-Hirsch et al. 2010).

## 6 Future Directions for Research and Practice

While there is much research on the social and emotional needs of gifted students in general, there is little on the SEL of IGS. For those IGS who are underachieving or are disadvantaged, scaffolding their well-being will enhance their talent development. This section elaborates the need for more SEL programmes to focus on the holistic needs of IGS, more resourcing and research within the Australian context, increased student voice, and more rigorous longitudinal evaluations of SEL programmes for IGS.

Australian ‘research, policy and practice... are converging on a view of student well-being and academic success as being highly interrelated and mutually supportive’ (Stafford et al. 2007, np). For policy to support SEL practice (Long et al. 2015), many gifted education policies need reviewing and updating (e.g. see NSW Gifted Education Policy 2004). Further empirical research investigating links between IGS’s well-being, behaviours, and academic achievement needs to be undertaken from an Australian perspective (Stafford et al. 2007). Wiley and Hébert (2014) call for systematic research on the constructs that influence IGS’s socio-emotional growth within varying contexts. For example, empirical research could explore how differentiated instructional practice within flexible groupings supports IGS’s SEL (Gross 2010; Henderson 2007). More research on students’ perspectives may highlight their views on the SEL competencies, or enable assessing specific aspects such as resiliency, buoyancy, and self-concept. Interestingly, how these constructs are exhibited in gifted students who attend enrichment programmes are currently being explored (Smith et al. 2016).

If the quality of programmes impacts student outcomes (Dix et al. 2010), then further rigorous multi-method longitudinal evaluations of programmes are needed to address their sustainability (Durlak et al. 2015). While evaluating SEL programmes is crucial, ‘reliable and valid assessment tools are necessary to conduct needs assessments and monitor the success of SEL programs over time’ (Haggerty et al. 2011, p. 4). This suggests that innovative assessment tools specific to the unique individual needs of IGS are warranted, particularly for underachievers who might be more likely to display inappropriate behaviours and mismatched social interactions. This development should then be followed through with research-based programmes and more resourcing to meet the diverse SEL needs of IGS sociocultural groups (Jarvis 2013).

## 7 Conclusion

This chapter was concerned with IGS’s unique characteristics that can be exhibited so complexly that they require unique supportive strategies and educational provisions to enable the holistic development of their intellectual, social, and emotional growth. Founded on the CASEL framework, many research-based strategies can support

IGS's development of SEL competencies of self-awareness, self-management, social awareness, relationship skills, and responsible decision-making. These supportive strategies can help develop effective goal setting, student resiliency, buoyancy, motivation, self-concept, and self-regulation to enhance their potential. Overall, regarding SEL needs of IGS, there are three key considerations. First, intellectually gifted students's asynchrony of social, emotional, and intellectual growth mean that many think, feel, experience, and respond to external influences differently to their same-age average ability peers. Second, the unique characteristics of intellectually gifted students necessitate comprehensive identification and unique teaching programmes and provisions to meet their individual academic and socio-emotional learning needs. Finally, educators, parents, and significant others can collaboratively use a variety of programmes, strategies, and resources to teach SEL to holistically support the social, emotional, and intellectual growth and well-being of intellectually gifted students.

## References

- Askill-Williams, H., & Lawson, M. J. (2013). Teachers' knowledge and confidence for promoting positive mental health in primary school communities. *Asia-Pacific Journal of Teacher Education, 41*(2), 126–143.
- Assouline, S., Colangelo, N., Van Tassel-Baska, J., & Lupkowski-Shoplik, A. (Eds.). (2015). *A nation empowered: Evidence trumps the excuses holding back America's brightest students*. Iowa City, IA: The Connie Belin and Jacqueline N. Blank International Center for Gifted Education and Talent Development.
- Australian Curriculum Assessment and Reporting Authority (ACARA). (2015). *Primary Matters, 6*.
- Australian Curriculum Assessment and Reporting Authority (ACARA). (2016). *Collaborative problem-solving online assessment and the Australian Curriculum Interim project report*. ACARA.
- Australian Gifted Support Centre. (2014). *Stepping stones course*. Retrieved from <http://australiangiftedsupport.com/articles/social-skills/>
- Australian Government Department of Health (AGDH). (2010). *KidsMatter: Australian primary schools mental health initiative*. AGDH.
- Ball, C., Mann, L., & Stamm, C. (1994). Decision-making abilities of intellectually gifted and non-gifted children. *Australian Journal of Psychology, 46*(1), 13–20.
- Bannister-Tyrell, M., Smith, S. R., Merrotsy, P., & Cornish, L. (2014). Taming a 'many-headed monster': Tarricone's taxonomy of metacognition. *TalentEd, 28*(1/2), 1–12.
- Bencik-Kangal, S. Y., & Ari, M. (2013). Investigation of the effects of creative drama programs on moral development of gifted and typical children. *Egitim ve Bilim-Education and Science, 38*, 308–320.
- Betts, G. T. (2003). *The autonomous learning model for high school programming*. Orangevale: Gifted Education Communicator, Fall/Winter.
- Blaas, S. (2014). The relationship between social-emotional difficulties and underachievement of gifted students. *Australian Journal of Guidance and Counselling, 24*(2), 243–255.
- Bond, M. (2013). Unmasking the perfectionist: Assisting the underachieving gifted perfectionist. *Vision, 23*(2), 12–14.
- Capern, T., & Hammond, L. (2014). Establishing positive relationships with secondary gifted students and students with emotional/behavioural disorders: Giving these diverse learners what they need. *Australian Journal of Teacher Education, 39*(4), 3.

- Cash, R. M. (2011). *Advancing differentiation: Thinking and learning for the 21st century*. Minneapolis, MN: Free Spirit Publishing Inc.
- Chandra Handa, M. (2009). Learner-centred differentiation model: A new framework. *Australasian Journal of Gifted Education*, 18(2), 55–66.
- Christopher, M. M., & Shewmaker, J. (2010). The relationship of perfectionism to affective variables in gifted and highly able children. *Gifted Child Today*, 33(3), 21–30.
- Clark, B. (2013). *Growing up gifted: Developing the potential of children at school and at home* (8th ed.). Columbus, OH: Pearson.
- Collaborative for Academic, Social, and Emotional Learning (CASEL). (2007). *How evidence-based SEL programs work to produce greater student success in school and life*. Chicago, IL: CASEL.
- Collaborative for Academic, Social, and Emotional Learning (CASEL). (2013). *CASEL guide: Effective social and emotional learning programs: Preschool and elementary school edition*. Chicago, IL: CASEL.
- Collaborative for Academic, Social, and Emotional Learning (CASEL). (2015). *CASEL guide: Effective social and emotional learning programs: Middle and high school edition*. Chicago, IL: CASEL.
- Commonwealth of Australia. (2001). *The education of gifted children*. Senate Employment, Workplace Relations, Small Business and Education References Committee. Canberra: Australian Government Publishing Service.
- Cross, T. L. (2005). *The social and emotional lives of gifted kids: Understanding and guiding their development*. Waco, TX: Prufrock Press Inc.
- Dare, L., Smith, S. R., & Nowecki, E. (2016). Parents' experiences of grade-based acceleration: Successes, struggles, and subsequent needs. *Australasian Journal of Gifted Education*, 25(2), 6.
- Department for Education and Child Development (DECD). (2016). Gifted and talented children and students policy. *DECD*. Retrieved from <https://www.decd.sa.gov.au/sites/g/files/net691ff/gifted-talented-students-policy.pdf?v=1467090054>
- Dix, K. L., Keeves, J. P., Slee, P., Lawson, M. J., Russell, A., Askill-Williams, H., et al. (2010). *KidsMatter primary evaluation: Technical report and user guide*. Adelaide: Shannon Research Press.
- Durlak, J. A., Domitrovich, C. E., Weissberg, R. P., & Gullotta, T. P. (Eds.). (2015). *Handbook of social and emotional learning: Research and practice*. New York, NY: The Guilford Press.
- Dweck, C. S. (2006). *Mindsets: The new psychology of success*. NY: Ballantine Books.
- Eddles-Hirsch, K., Vialle, W., Rogers, K. B., & McCormick, J. (2010). "Just challenge those high-ability learners and they'll be all right!" The impact of social context and challenging instruction on the affective development of high-ability students. *Journal of Advanced Academics*, 22(1), 102–124.
- Eyre, D. (2016). *High performance learning: How to become a world class school*. London: Routledge.
- Folsom, C. (2011). Learning to teach the cognitive skills and emotional dispositions required in the 21st century. In D. A. Contreras (Ed.), *Psychology of thinking* (pp. 1–38). Hauppauge, NY: Nova Science Publishers.
- Fraser-Seeto, K. T., Howard, S. J., & Woodcock, S. (2015). An investigation of teachers' awareness and willingness to engage with a self-directed professional development package on gifted and talented education. *Australian Journal of Teacher Education*, 40(1), 1–14.
- Gagné, F. (2010). Motivation within the DMGT 2.0 framework. *High Ability Studies*, 1(2), 81–99.
- Galbraith, J., & Delisle, J. (2011). *The gifted teen survival guide: Smart, sharp, and ready for (almost) anything* (4th ed.). Golden Valley, MN: Free Spirit Publishing.
- Gallagher, S., & Smith, S. (2013). Acceleration for talent development: Parents and teachers' attitudes towards supporting the social and emotional needs of gifted children. *International Journal for Talent Development and Creativity*, 1(2), 97–112.
- Garn, A. C., & Jolly, J. L. (2014). High ability students' voice on learning motivation. *Journal of Advanced Academics*, 25(1), 7–24.
- Geake, J. G. (2009). *The brain at school: Educational neuroscience in the classroom*. London: McGraw-Hill Education.

- Geake, J. G., & Gross, M. U. M. (2008). Teachers' negative affect toward academically gifted students: An evolutionary psychological study. *Gifted Child Quarterly*, 52(3), 217–231.
- Greenspoon, T. S. (2013). Perfectionism: A counselor's role in the recovery process. In T. L. Cross & J. R. Cross (Eds.), *Handbook for counselors serving students with gifts and talents* (pp. 597–613). Waco, TX: Prufrock Press.
- Gross, M. U. M. (2010). *Miraca Gross in her own write: A lifetime in gifted education*. Sydney, NSW: GERRIC, UNSW.
- Haggerty, K., Elgin, J., & Woolley, A. (2011). *Social-emotional learning assessment measures for middle school youth, Raikes Foundation report*. Seattle: Social Development Research Group, University of Washington.
- Harper, A. (2013). *The development of empathy in gifted children through the lens of Dabrowski's theory of positive disintegration* (Unpublished masters degree thesis). University of New England, Australia.
- Hay, P. K., Gross, M. U. M., Hoekman, K., & Rogers, K. B. (2007). Prosocial reasoning and empathy in gifted children. *Australasian Journal of Gifted Education*, 16(2), 5–14.
- Henderson, L. (2007). Multi-level selective classes for gifted students. *International Education Journal*, 8(2), 60–67.
- Hoekman, K., McCormick, J., & Barnett, K. (2005). The important role of optimism in a motivational investigation of the education of gifted adolescents. *Gifted Child Quarterly*, 49(2), 99–110.
- Humphrey, N. (2013). *Social and emotional learning: A critical appraisal*. London: Sage Publications.
- Iizuka, C. A., Barrett, P. M., Gillies, R., Cook, C. R., & Marinovic, W. (2015). Preliminary evaluation of the FRIENDS for Life Program on students' and teachers' emotional states for a school in a low socio-economic status area. *Australian Journal of Teacher Education*, 40(3), 1.
- Inman, T., & Kirchner, J. (2016). *Parenting gifted children 101: An introduction to gifted kids and their needs*. Waco: Prufrock Press.
- Jarvis, J. M. (2013). Supporting diverse gifted students. In M. Hyde, L. Carpenter, & R. Conway (Eds.), *Diversity, inclusion and engagement* (pp. 297–316). South Melbourne, VIC: Oxford University Press.
- Jung, J. Y., Barnett, K., Gross, M. U. M., & McCormick, J. (2011). Levels of intellectual giftedness, culture, and the forced-choice dilemma. *Roeper Review*, 33(3), 182–197.
- Kaplan, S. N. (1993). The grid: A model to construct differentiated curriculum for the gifted. In J. S. Renzulli (Ed.), *Systems and models for developing programs for the gifted and talented* (pp. 180–193). Highett, VIC: Hawker Brownlow Education.
- Kronborg, L., & Plunkett, M. (2013). Responding to professional learning: How effective teachers differentiate teaching and learning strategies to engage highly able adolescents. *Australasian Journal of Gifted Education*, 22(2), 52–63.
- Landis, R. N., & Reschly, A. L. (2013). Re-examining gifted underachievement and dropout through the lens of student engagement. *Journal for the Education of the Gifted*, 36(2), 220–249.
- Lassig, C. J. (2009). Teachers' attitudes towards the gifted: The importance of professional development and school culture. *Australasian Journal of Gifted Education*, 18(2), 32–42.
- Long, L. C., Barnett, K., & Rogers, K. B. (2015). Exploring the relationship between principal, policy, and gifted program scope and quality. *Journal for the Education of the Gifted*, 38(2), 118–140.
- Luthar, S. S. (2006). Resilience in development: A synthesis of research across five decades. In D. Cicchetti & D. J. Cohen (Eds.), *Developmental psychopathology: Risk, disorder, and adaptation* (pp. 740–795). New York: Wiley.
- Maher, L., & Geeves, J. (2014). Acceleration: Dispelling the myths with research and reality. *Australasian Journal of Gifted Education*, 23(1), 39–48.
- Maker, C. J., & Schiever, S. W. (2010). *Curriculum development and teaching strategies for gifted learners* (3rd ed.). Austin, TX: Pro-Ed.

- Martin, A. J. (2012). The role of personal best (PB) goals in the achievement and behavioral engagement of students with ADHD and students without ADHD. *Contemporary Educational Psychology, 37*, 91–105.
- Martin, A. J., & Marsh, H. W. (2008). Academic buoyancy: Towards an understanding of students' everyday academic resilience. *Journal of School Psychology, 46*, 53–83.
- McCoach, D. B. (2007). What predicts teachers' attitudes toward the gifted? *Gifted Child Quarterly, 51*(3), 246–254.
- McCulliss, D., & Chamberlain, D. (2013). Bibliotherapy for youth and adolescents: School-based application and research. *Journal of Poetry Therapy, 26*(1), 13–40.
- Morisano, D., & Shore, B. M. (2010). Can personal goal setting tap the potential of the gifted underachiever? *Roeper Review, 32*(4), 249–258.
- Mueller, C. E. (2009). Protective factors as barriers to depression in gifted and nongifted adolescents. *Gifted Child Quarterly, 53*(1), 3–14.
- New South Wales Department of Education and Training (NSW DET). (2004). *Policy and implementation strategies for the education of gifted and talented students*. Sydney, Australia: NSW, DET.
- North, B., Smith, S., Gross, M. U. M. (2015). Under pressure: The effects of academic pressure on gifted students in high-stakes assessment contexts. Paper presented at the *World Gifted Conference*, Odense, Denmark.
- O'Neill, M., Calder, A., & Allen, B. (2014). Tall poppies: Bullying behaviours faced by Australian high-performance school-age athletes. *Journal of School Violence, 13*(2), 210–227.
- Ozturk, M. A., & Debelak, C. (2008). Affective benefits from academic competitions for middle school gifted students. *Gifted Child Today, 31*(2), 48–53.
- Peterson, J. S. (2009). Myth 17: Gifted and talented individuals do not have unique social and emotional needs. *Gifted Child Quarterly, 53*(4), 280–282.
- Piechowski, M. M. (2008). Discovering Dabrowski's theory. In S. Mendaglio (Ed.), *Dabrowski's theory of positive disintegration* (pp. 41–77). Scottsdale, AZ: Great Potential Press.
- Plunkett, M., & Kronborg, L. (2007). The importance of social-emotional context: Perceptions of students, parents, and teachers regarding an extended curriculum program for students with high abilities. *Australasian Journal of Gifted Education, 16*(2), 35–43.
- Plunkett, M., & Kronborg, L. (2011). Learning to be a teacher of the Gifted: The importance of examining opinions and challenging misconceptions. *Gifted & Talented International, 26*(1–2), 31–46.
- Prykaza, J. (2013). *Gifted and talented education: The effects of genre specific bibliotherapy on social justice and moral reasoning* (Unpublished Honours dissertation). School of Education, UNSW, Australia.
- Roeper, A., & Silverman, L. K. (2009). Giftedness and moral promise. In D. Ambrose & T. Cross (Eds.), *Morality, ethics, and gifted minds* (pp. 251–264). New York: Springer Science.
- Rogers, K. B. (2007). Lessons learned about educating the gifted and talented: A synthesis of the research on educational practice. *Gifted Child Quarterly, 4*, 382–396.
- Rowley, J. (2012). Professional development needs of teachers to identify and cater for gifted students. *Australasian Journal of Gifted Education, 21*(2), 75–80.
- Shechtman, Z., & Silektor, A. (2012). Social competencies and difficulties of gifted children compared to nongifted peers. *Roeper Review, 34*(1), 63–72.
- Smith, S. (2015). A dynamic differentiation framework for talent enhancement: Findings from syntheses and teacher perceptions. *Australasian Journal of Gifted Education, 24*(1), 59–72.
- Smith, S. R., & Laura, R. (2009). Repersonalizing educational ecologies to nurture the social and affective needs of gifted children. *Asia-Pacific Journal of Gifted and Talented Education, 1*(1), 23–40.
- Smith, S. R., Martin, A., & North, B. (2016). Socio-affective influences on gifted students in enrichment programs. The Tournament of Minds experience. *Beyond the Boundaries in Gifted Education, AAEGT National Conference*, UNSW, Sydney.

- Stafford, K., Moore, C., Keith, K., Kemp, E., & Hazell, T. (2007). *Proving and improving: Exploring the links between resilience, behaviour and academic outcomes*. Paper presented at AARE Conference, Hunter Institute of Mental Health, Newcastle, Australia.
- Sternberg, R. J. (2012). Teaching for ethical reasoning. *International Journal of Educational Psychology, 1*(1), 35–50.
- Terry, A. W. (2008). Student voices, global echoes: Service-learning and the gifted. *Roeper Review, 35*, 45–51.
- Tomlinson, C. (2014). *The differentiated classroom: Responding to the needs of all learners* (2nd ed.). Alexandria, VA, USA: ASCD.
- Townend, G., Pendergast, D., & Garvis, S. (2014). Academic self-concept in twice-exceptional students: What the literature tells us. *TalentEd, 28*, 75–89.
- VanTassel-Baska, J., & Stambaugh, T. (2006). Affective curriculum and instruction for gifted learners. In J. VanTassel-Baska & T. Stambaugh (Eds.), *Comprehensive curriculum for gifted learners* (3rd ed., pp. 211–226). Boston, MA: Pearson.
- Vialle, W. (2012). The role of school counsellors in fostering giftedness: The Australian experience. In A. Ziegler, C. Fischer, H. Stoeger, & M. Reutlinger (Eds.), *Gifted education as a life-long challenge* (pp. 265–278). Berlin: LIT-Verlag.
- Vialle, W., Heaven, P. C. L., & Ciarrochi, J. (2007). On being gifted, but sad and misunderstood: Social, emotional, and academic outcomes of gifted students in the Wollongong Youth Study. *Educational Research and Evaluation, 13*(6), 569–586.
- Vialle, W., & Rogers, K. B. (2012). Gifted, talented, or educationally disadvantaged? In C. Forlin (Ed.), *Future directions for inclusive teacher education: An international perspective* (pp. 112–120). London: Routledge.
- Victorian Government Education and Training Committee. (2012). *Inquiry into the education of gifted and talented students*. Australia: Victorian Government Printer.
- Webb, J. (2013). *Searching for meaning: Idealism, bright minds, disillusionment, and hope*. Tucson, AZ: Great Potential Press.
- Webb, J. T., Amend, E. R., Webb, N. E., Goerss, J., Beljan, P., & Olenchak, F. R. (2005). *Misdiagnosis and dual diagnoses of gifted children and adults: ADHD, bipolar, OCD, Asperger's, depression, and other disorders*. Scottsdale, AZ: Great Potential Press.
- Western Australia Department of Education. (2011). *Primary extension and challenge (PEAC) program for years 5–7*. Australia: WADE.
- Wiley, K., & Hébert, T. P. (2014). Social and emotional traits of gifted youth. In J. A. Plucker & C. M. Callahan (Eds.), *Critical issues and practices in gifted education: What the research says* (2nd ed., pp. 593–608). Waco, TX: Prufrock Press.
- Williams, F. E. (1993). The cognitive-affective interaction model for enriching gifted programs. In J. S. Renzulli (Ed.), *Systems and models for developing programs for the gifted and talented* (pp. 461–484). Highett, VIC: Hawker Brownlow Education.
- Wolf, N., & Chessor, D. (2011). The affective characteristics of gifted children: Can peer victimisation make a difference? *Australasian Journal of Gifted Education, 20*(1), 38–52.
- Wormald, C., & Vialle, W. (2011). *Dual exceptionality*. Department of Education, Employment and Workplace Relations: AAEGT.
- Wormald, C., Vialle, W., & Rogers, K. (2014). Young and misunderstood in the education system: A case study of giftedness and specific learning disabilities. *Australasian Journal of Gifted Education, 23*(2), 16–28.