Indonesian Journal of Community and Special Needs Education

Journal homepage: http://ejournal.upi.edu/index.php/IJCSNE/

Assessment and Identification Tools for Gifted and Talented Learners: A Comprehensive Review

Tyrone O. Gil Jr.[*]

University of the Philippines, Philippines
[*]Correspondence: E-mail: togil@up.edu.ph

ABSTRACT

Identifying gifted and talented learners remains a complex task due to the multifaceted nature of giftedness and the absence of a universally accepted definition. This paper presented a comprehensive review of assessment and identification tools employed in gifted education, categorizing them into ability tests, achievement tests, creativity tests, nominations, and portfolios. Using a systematic literature review approach, the study examined the implications, strengths, and challenges associated with each tool, emphasizing issues such as cultural bias, ceiling effects, and the need for multidimensional evaluation. The findings highlighted that while standardized measures provided valuable cognitive and academic data, they should be complemented by qualitative methods to ensure equitable identification across diverse populations. The paper recommends adopting a holistic, multidisciplinary framework supported by trained assessors to address the limitations of single-method approaches. This integrated strategy is essential for recognizing and nurturing the full range of abilities among gifted learners, thereby maximizing their academic and personal potential.

ARTICLE INFO

Article History:
Submitted/Received 08 May 2025
First Revised 10 Jun 2025
Accepted 11 Aug 2025
First Available online 12 Aug 2025
Publication Date 01 Mar 2026

Keyword:
Assesment,
Assessment and identification,
Giftedness,
Gifted education,
Tools.

1. INTRODUCTION

The identification of gifted and talented learners is a critical prerequisite for providing tailored educational support and fostering inclusive learning environments (Saadu *et al*., 2024). This process involves systematically recognizing students with exceptional abilities and specific academic talents (Cao *et al*., 2017). Assessment results from various tools guide educators and psychologists in designing instructional strategies and determining the most appropriate educational placement to meet the unique needs of these learners (Pfeiffer, 2012). Despite continuous efforts, addressing the diverse profiles of gifted students remains a persistent challenge (Noor, 2023).

In gifted education, assessment and identification must be clear, structured, and multi-faceted (Worrell & Erwin, 2011). Gifted students have educational needs that are distinct from those of their peers, and without accurate identification and adequate support, they risk underachievement, loss of academic growth, and disengagement (Hodges *et al*., 2018; Brulles & Winebrenner, 2011). Understanding each student's strengths, interests, and learning styles through comprehensive assessment enables differentiated instruction, enrichment, acceleration, and appropriate program placement (Brown *et al*., 2005; Cao *et al*., 2017).

Given the significant impact of accurate identification, this paper reviews current assessment and identification tools in gifted education, categorizing them into ability tests, achievement tests, creativity tests, nominations, and portfolios. It also examines challenges, cultural considerations, and best practices, offering an updated perspective to inform more equitable, holistic approaches in identifying and supporting gifted and talented learners.

2. METHODS

This study employed a systematic literature review to examine the assessment and identification tools used for recognizing gifted and talented learners. The review process involved searching academic databases and relevant journals in gifted education using keywords such as "assessment," "gifted education," "identification," and "giftedness." Reference lists of retrieved articles were also screened to identify additional relevant sources. Inclusion criteria were:

(i) Studies focusing on assessment instruments and identification methods for gifted learners;
(ii) Publications with clear methodological rigor; and
(iii) Research contributing to the understanding of implications, challenges, and best practices in gifted education.

The selected literature was analyzed and categorized into five major types of assessment tools: ability tests, achievement tests, creativity tests, nominations, and portfolios. For each category, the review examined its applications, advantages, limitations, and implications for equitable gifted identification. The synthesis aimed to provide educators, researchers, and policymakers with an updated and evidence-based perspective on assessment practices in gifted education.

3. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

3.1. Overview of Reviewed Assessment Tools

The review identified five principal categories of assessment and identification tools for gifted and talented learners: ability tests, achievement tests, creativity tests, nominations, and portfolios. These categories encompass a combination of quantitative and qualitative

DOI: https://doi.org/10.17509/ijcsne.v6i1.89074
p- ISSN 2775-8400 e- ISSN 2775-9857

approaches, each with distinct purposes, strengths, and limitations (Cao *et al*., 2017; Worrell & Erwin, 2011). The literature emphasizes that giftedness is a multidimensional construct involving cognitive, academic, creative, and socio-emotional characteristics (Renzulli, 1999). Consequently, no single instrument can fully capture the scope of a learner's potential.

Over the past two decades, there has been an observable shift from reliance on single-score IQ measures toward more holistic frameworks that integrate multiple criteria (Hodges *et al*., 2018). This shift responds to persistent concerns over cultural and linguistic bias, ceiling effects, and the underrepresentation of certain demographic groups in gifted education programs (Ford & Harmon, 2001; Peters, 2022). In particular, scholars advocate for multi-method approaches that combine standardized metrics with authentic, context-based evaluations such as portfolios and teacher observations (Luria *et al*., 2016).

Table 1 in the full paper (not reproduced here) categorizes the reviewed tools by their measurement focus, mode of administration, and target population, highlighting that most traditional measures privilege academic and cognitive ability, while fewer systematically assess creativity or leadership potential. Importantly, the review found that the tools vary in their capacity to detect talents in culturally and linguistically diverse (CLD) populations. For example, while nonverbal ability tests reduce language demands, they may still reflect cultural assumptions embedded in test design (Carman *et al*., 2020).

Table 1. Summary of reviewed assessment tools for gifted and talented identification.

Tool Category	Examples	Primary Strengths	Main Limitations	Best Use Context
Ability Tests	WISC-V, Stanford-Binet (SB5), Woodcock-Johnson (WJ-IV), CogAT, OLSAT, Raven's Matrices, NNAT	Standardized, psychometrically robust; detailed cognitive profile; can identify high intellectual potential; nonverbal formats reduce language bias.	Cultural/linguistic bias; ceiling effects; costly and time-consuming (individual tests); group tests lack depth	Initial screening and detailed cognitive assessment, especially when combined with other measures
Achievement Tests	Stanford Achievement Test, WIAT, WJ-IV ACH, KTEA, curriculum-based assessments	Measures mastery of learned content; identifies readiness for advanced work; above-level testing differentiates high achievers	Ceiling effects, curriculum mismatch, and cultural bias may miss non-academic giftedness.	Identifying academic readiness and placement in accelerated/advanced coursework

DOI: https://doi.org/10.17509/ijcsne.v6i1.89074
p- ISSN 2775-8400 e- ISSN 2775-9857

Table 1 (continue). Summary of reviewed assessment tools for gifted and talented identification.

Tool Category	Examples	Primary Strengths	Main Limitations	Best Use Context
Creativity Tests	Torrance Tests of Creative Thinking (TTCT), Remote Associates Test (RAT), divergent thinking tasks	Captures non-traditional giftedness; reduces the underrepresentation of minority students; fosters a holistic understanding	Subjective scoring, cultural interpretation differences, and verbal bias in some formats	Complementing traditional measures to identify innovative thinkers and problem-solvers
Nominations	Teacher, parent, peer, and self-nominations; gifted characteristic checklists	Context-rich insights, cost-effective, identify talents missed by tests	High false-negative rates, bias from raters, inconsistent training	Preliminary screening, especially when multiple raters and clear criteria are used
Portfolios	Academic projects, creative writing, artwork, Total Talent Portfolio	Authentic, longitudinal evidence; culturally responsive; encourages self-reflection	Time/resource intensive; subjective evaluation; unequal access to resources	Identifying diverse talents, especially in underrepresented and special populations

The convergence of evidence underscores two critical points:

(i) Balanced assessment systems are essential for capturing the full range of giftedness manifestations.

(ii) Assessor expertise plays a decisive role in the validity and fairness of identification outcomes (Gilmore & Campbell, 2009).

This discussion begins with ability tests, the most widely used yet often debated category in gifted identification.

3.2. Ability Tests

3.2.1. Commonly used instruments

Ability tests remain a cornerstone in gifted identification, designed to assess cognitive potential rather than acquired academic knowledge. Among the most widely used instruments are the Wechsler Intelligence Scale for Children–Fifth Edition (WISC-V), the Stanford-Binet Intelligence Scales–Fifth Edition (SB5), and the Woodcock-Johnson Tests of Cognitive Abilities (WJ-IV) (Abu-Hamour *et al*., 2012).

The WISC-V measures multiple cognitive domains, including verbal comprehension, visual-spatial reasoning, fluid reasoning, working memory, and processing speed. Its subtests, such as block design, matrix reasoning, and figure weights, provide a nuanced profile of strengths and weaknesses (Wellisch & Brown, 2012). Similarly, the SB5 offers both verbal and nonverbal subtests across five cognitive factors, allowing for identification in individuals as young as two

DOI: https://doi.org/10.17509/ijcsne.v6i1.89074
p- ISSN 2775-8400 e- ISSN 2775-9857

years old (Cao *et al*., 2017). The WJ-IV incorporates the Cattell-Horn-Carroll (CHC) theory of intelligence, providing a broad cognitive assessment suitable for ages 2–90+ (Abu-Hamour *et al*., 2012).

Group-administered ability tests such as the Cognitive Abilities Test (CogAT), Otis-Lennon School Ability Test (OLSAT), and Raven's Progressive Matrices are frequently used for large-scale screening due to their cost-effectiveness and efficiency (Pfeiffer, 2002). These tests, especially nonverbal formats, aim to identify high potential in linguistically diverse populations.

3.2.2. Strengths in indentifying cognitive potential

The primary strength of ability tests lies in their psychometric rigor and standardization. They provide quantifiable measures of cognitive functioning that can be compared across individuals and populations (Worrell & Erwin, 2011; Frost *et al*., 2007). When administered individually, these tests offer rich diagnostic profiles, informing targeted educational planning, enrichment, and acceleration options (Brown *et al*., 2005).

Nonverbal ability tests, such as the Naglieri Nonverbal Ability Test (NNAT) and Raven's Progressive Matrices, reduce linguistic demands, making them particularly valuable for CLD students. Studies have shown that these assessments can improve proportional representation in gifted programs by minimizing the bias associated with verbal-heavy measures (Carman *et al*., 2020).

Moreover, above-average scores on ability tests often correlate with long-term academic success, especially when combined with other indicators such as creativity and motivation (Sternberg, 2009). This predictive capacity reinforces their continued relevance in identification systems.

3.2.3. Challenges: cultural bias, ceiling effects, and administration limitations

Despite their advantages, ability tests face substantial criticisms. Cultural and linguistic bias remains a persistent concern. Many standardized tests are normed on the majority populations, which can disadvantage students from underrepresented groups (Ford & Harmon, 2001; Shaunessy *et al*., 2004). Even nonverbal measures may embed cultural assumptions in stimuli or problem-solving approaches.

Another limitation is the ceiling effect, when tests fail to differentiate among the highest-performing students because the difficulty level does not extend far enough (Worrell & Erwin, 2011). This can obscure the identification of profoundly gifted learners and lead to misplacement in programs that fail to challenge them (Staus *et al*., 2021).

Group-administered tests, while efficient, often sacrifice diagnostic depth. They may be influenced by test-taking skills, fatigue, or classroom distractions, and offer fewer opportunities for behavioral observation (Cao *et al*., 2017). Conversely, individually administered tests, though more comprehensive, require substantial time and trained personnel, raising cost and scalability issues (Oak *et al*., 2018).

3.2.4. Strategies for improving equity in ability testing

Research consistently recommends that ability tests be used as part of a multi-criteria identification process rather than as a standalone measure (Hodges *et al*., 2018; Worrell & Erwin, 2011). Combining them with achievement tests, creativity measures, and qualitative data increases the likelihood of capturing diverse manifestations of giftedness (Luria *et al*., 2016).

DOI: https://doi.org/10.17509/ijcsne.v6i1.89074
p- ISSN 2775-8400 e- ISSN 2775-9857

Culturally responsive assessment practices are essential. This includes reviewing norming samples, incorporating nonverbal measures, and providing assessor training to mitigate bias (Peters & Gentry, 2012). The administration process should be sensitive to language barriers, socioeconomic context, and prior educational opportunities (Shaunessy *et al*., 2004).

Finally, advancements in computer-adaptive testing offer promise for reducing ceiling effects by dynamically adjusting item difficulty based on student responses, thus better differentiating performance at the upper extremes (Warne, 2012). Integrating such innovations could enhance both precision and fairness in gifted identification.

3.3. Achievement Test

3.3.1. Standardized and curriculum-based measures

Achievement tests measure a learner's current mastery of academic content, offering a direct evaluation of what has been learned rather than potential to learn (Worrell & Erwin, 2011; Zimmerman & Dibenedetto, 2008). Widely used instruments include the Stanford Achievement Test, Wechsler Individual Achievement Test (WIAT), Woodcock-Johnson Tests of Achievement (WJ-IV ACH), and Kaufman Test of Educational Achievement (KTEA) (Cao *et al*., 2017). These standardized tests provide percentile ranks and standard scores, allowing comparison with national norms.

Curriculum-based assessments (CBAs), such as teacher-made tests, unit exams, and end-of-year assessments, align closely with the specific curriculum taught in the classroom. While standardized tests offer comparability across contexts, CBAs provide a localized picture of learning that may be more relevant to immediate instructional planning (Hanif *et al*., 2017).

In the context of gifted identification, above-level testing is particularly valuable. Administering assessments designed for older students to younger candidates increases the ceiling and provides a more accurate differentiation among high achievers (Warne, 2012; Rambo-Hernandez & Warne, 2015; Callahan *et al*., 2022). For example, a Grade 5 student taking a Grade 8 mathematics test can reveal readiness for accelerated placement that standard grade-level tests would not capture.

3.3.2. Role of above-level testing

Above-level testing helps to address the ceiling effects that often limit traditional grade-level assessments. By presenting more challenging material, these tests can distinguish between moderately gifted and highly gifted students, providing more precise placement recommendations (Cao *et al*., 2017; Acar *et al*., 2016; Kettler & Bower, 2017).

The Scholastic Aptitude Test (SAT) and ACT, typically designed for college-bound high school students, have been adapted in some talent search programs for middle school students to identify exceptional academic potential early (Warne, 2012). Evidence suggests that such assessments, when paired with enrichment programs, can significantly boost long-term academic trajectories (Renzulli, 1999).

3.3.3. Limitations: mismatch with curriculum and bias issues

Despite their usefulness, achievement tests are not without problems. A key limitation is curricular mismatch; the test content may not reflect what a student has been taught, particularly in non-standardized educational settings or alternative curricula. Gifted students may perform poorly not because of a lack of ability but due to unfamiliarity with test formats or content domains.

DOI: https://doi.org/10.17509/ijcsne.v6i1.89074
p- ISSN 2775-8400 e- ISSN 2775-9857

Bias in norming samples can also disadvantage students from culturally and linguistically diverse backgrounds (Scheiber, 2015). Additionally, abbreviated forms of achievement tests (sometimes used for efficiency) may fail to capture the depth and complexity of a gifted learner's abilities, especially in reasoning-intensive domains (Cao *et al*., 2017).

Moreover, the focus on test-taking skills over deep understanding may lead to inflated scores that do not truly represent advanced learning (Worrell & Erwin, 2011). This overemphasis on standardized metrics risks narrowing the curriculum and overlooking other domains of giftedness, such as creativity or leadership.

3.3.4. Best practices for enhancing validity

For optimal results, achievement tests should be aligned with both curriculum goals and identification purposes. Above-level testing should be more widely implemented to extend the ceiling and differentiate high-end performance. It is also advisable to integrate achievement measures with qualitative assessments such as teacher observations, portfolios, and creativity tests.

Test administrators must be trained to interpret scores in the context of students' backgrounds, considering language proficiency, socioeconomic status, and prior educational experiences. Adopting culturally responsive test design and norming procedures can mitigate bias and ensure fairer identification outcomes (Kūkea Shultz & Englert, 2021).

3.4. Creativity Tests

3.4.1. Major instruments

Creativity tests evaluate divergent thinking, originality, and the ability to generate novel solutions (Luria *et al*., 2016). The Torrance Tests of Creative Thinking (TTCT) are the most widely used, offering both verbal and figural formats to assess fluency, flexibility, originality, and elaboration (Coronado-Hijón, 2015). Other measures include the Remote Associates Test (RAT) and context-specific tasks designed to elicit innovative thinking in academic or real-world scenarios (Lee *et al*., 2014).

These assessments often involve open-ended prompts, such as "List as many uses as you can for a paperclip" or "Create a drawing from this abstract shape." The responses are scored using standardized rubrics that evaluate the uniqueness, detail, and variety of ideas produced (Kaufman *et al*., 2011).

3.4.2. Contributions to holistic identification

Creativity tests are particularly valuable for identifying non-traditional giftedness—students who may not score highly on IQ or achievement tests but excel in imaginative thinking, problem-solving, or artistic expression (Renzulli, 1999). This is especially important in reducing the underrepresentation of minority and economically disadvantaged students in gifted programs (Alfaiz *et al*., 2020).

Research shows that minority students often perform equally well, or even better, on creativity tests compared to majority peers, suggesting these measures can help level the playing field. By assessing abilities less dependent on formal schooling and language proficiency, creativity tests provide a complementary perspective that supports more equitable identification.

3.4.3. Scoring subjectivity and cultural considerations

DOI: https://doi.org/10.17509/ijcsne.v6i1.89074
p- ISSN 2775-8400 e- ISSN 2775-9857

One major challenge in creativity assessment is subjectivity. While rubrics exist, the evaluation of originality and appropriateness often relies on scorer judgment, which may vary across raters (Torrance, 1984; Cropley, 1993). Training and inter-rater reliability checks are essential to minimize bias.

Cultural context also shapes what is perceived as "creative." For example, certain responses might be considered highly original in one culture but commonplace in another. This means that a culturally diverse panel of scorers may improve the fairness of evaluation.

Some creativity tests rely heavily on verbal responses, which can disadvantage English language learners. In such cases, figural or performance-based tasks may provide more equitable opportunities for demonstration of creative potential (Long *et al*., 2022).

3.4.4. Integrating creativity assessment into gifted education

Given the multidimensional nature of giftedness, creativity measures should not be used in isolation but rather integrated into a multi-method identification process (Luria *et al*., 2016). Combining creativity scores with ability, achievement, and portfolio assessments ensures a more complete picture of a student's capabilities.

Educators should also consider alternative creativity indicators, such as creative products (e.g., artwork, inventions, writing) and self-reports of creative engagement (Renzulli, 1999). While self-assessments have limitations in high-stakes contexts, they can still provide valuable supplementary insights.

Ultimately, creativity testing offers a pathway to broaden the definition of giftedness beyond purely academic or cognitive measures, helping to design educational programs that nurture innovation alongside intellect.

3.5. Nominations

3.5.1. Types: teacher, parent, peer, and self-nominations

Nominations involve identifying potential gifted and talented learners through the recommendations of individuals familiar with the student's abilities. This approach serves as an important complement to standardized assessments, providing insights from multiple contexts (Worrell & Erwin, 2011). Several nominations are in the following:

(i) Teacher nominations are the most widely used, leveraging educators' daily observations of students' academic performance, problem-solving approaches, and classroom behaviors (Larroder & Ogawa, 2015). Teachers can recognize abilities that may not emerge during standardized testing, such as leadership, resilience, or social intelligence.

(ii) Parent nominations offer perspectives from outside the school setting. Parents may notice talents in hobbies, extracurricular activities, or problem-solving in home environments (Worrell & Erwin, 2011).

(iii) Peer nominations involve students identifying classmates they perceive as exceptionally capable, often revealing social and creative leadership traits not easily measured through tests (Cao *et al*., 2017).

(iv) Self-nominations allow students to reflect on and advocate for their strengths, interests, and accomplishments, fostering self-awareness and agency in the identification process.

3.5.2. Advantages in capturing non-traditional giftedness

Nominations can highlight atypical gifted profiles, students who may excel in creativity, leadership, or problem-solving but underperform on standardized tests due to test anxiety, language barriers, or socio-economic disadvantage. They are also cost-effective and relatively

DOI: https://doi.org/10.17509/ijcsne.v6i1.89074
p- ISSN 2775-8400 e- ISSN 2775-9857

quick to implement as a screening tool before more resource-intensive assessments are administered.

When applied systematically, nominations increase the diversity of gifted program candidates, especially if nomination guidelines explicitly include multiple domains of giftedness (Renzulli, 1999). This broader perspective helps avoid overemphasis on purely academic measures.

3.5.3. Risks of bias and high false-negative rates

Despite their strengths, nominations are vulnerable to bias. Teachers may unconsciously favor students from similar cultural backgrounds or penalize students whose giftedness manifests in unconventional ways, such as questioning authority or deviating from standard classroom behavior (Hodges *et al*., 2018).

Parental nominations can also be influenced by varying levels of educational awareness, cultural perceptions of giftedness, or a desire to have their child recognized regardless of objective criteria (Cao *et al*., 2017). Similarly, peer nominations may be skewed by popularity dynamics rather than genuine ability (Van den Berg *et al*., 2015).

Research indicates that false-negative rates in teacher nominations can exceed 60%, meaning a significant proportion of gifted students are overlooked (McBee *et al*., 2016; Peters, 2021). This is especially problematic for students from marginalized backgrounds, further exacerbating underrepresentation.

3.5.4. Improving accuracy through training and criteria

To improve the reliability of nominations, it is essential to:

(i) Provide clear criteria and checklists describing observable gifted behaviors across multiple domains (Peters & Gentry, 2012).
(ii) Train nominators to recognize culturally and linguistically diverse expressions of giftedness.
(iii) Use multiple raters from different backgrounds to balance individual biases.
(iv) Lower nomination cutoffs to reduce false negatives at the initial screening stage (McBee *et al*., 2016).

Integrating nominations with other assessment tools ensures that promising students are not excluded solely due to subjective bias or inconsistent judgment.

3.6. Portofolios

3.6.1. Nature and examples of portfolio evidence

Portfolios are collections of student work demonstrating achievement, creativity, and growth over time (Hadaway & Marek-Schroer, 1992). They can include academic projects, artwork, creative writing, research reports, or problem-solving artifacts. Portfolios may be physical or digital (e-portfolios), the latter offering greater accessibility and ease of sharing.

Unlike one-time standardized tests, portfolios provide a longitudinal perspective on student development, capturing the process as well as the product (Worrell & Erwin, 2011). They are especially useful for identifying giftedness in non-traditional domains and among culturally diverse students who might be disadvantaged by standardized measures.

3.6.2. Benefits for culturally and linguistically diverse learners

DOI: https://doi.org/10.17509/ijcsne.v6i1.89074
p- ISSN 2775-8400 e- ISSN 2775-9857

Portfolios are considered a culturally responsive assessment method, allowing students to demonstrate capabilities in contexts that are familiar and meaningful to them (Wright & Borland, 1993). This can reduce cultural bias and provide evidence of talents that are not dependent on language proficiency or familiarity with test-taking strategies (Yassin *et al*., 2012).

In addition, portfolios encourage student self-reflection and metacognition, helping learners become more aware of their strengths and learning processes (Farahian & Avarzamani, 2018). Such reflective skills are important for the sustained development of giftedness beyond initial identification.

3.6.3. Time, resource, and evaluation challenges

While portfolios offer rich qualitative data, they are time- and labor-intensive to collect, curate, and evaluate (Luria *et al*., 2016). Without clear scoring rubrics, portfolio evaluation risks subjectivity and inconsistency between assessors (VanTassel-Baska, 2001).

Another challenge is ensuring comparability across students. Differences in access to resources (such as technology, materials, or extracurricular opportunities) can influence the quality of portfolio entries, potentially advantaging students from more affluent backgrounds.

3.6.4. Recommendations for reliable portofolio assessment

To maximize the validity and reliability of portfolios in gifted identification, experts recommend:

(i) Developing standardized rubrics with descriptors for different performance levels (Worrell & Erwin, 2011).
(ii) Using multiple raters and consensus scoring to minimize individual bias.
(iii) Combining portfolio assessment with other measures (e.g., ability and achievement tests) for triangulation of evidence.
(iv) Providing student and teacher training on portfolio development to ensure that submissions accurately reflect the learner's abilities.

The Total Talent Portfolio model (Renzulli, 1999) exemplifies a systematic approach, collecting comprehensive data on a student's abilities, interests, and learning styles over time to inform individualized educational planning.

3.7. Cross-category Analysis

3.7.1. Comparative strengths and weaknesses

The reviewed assessment tools (ability tests, achievement tests, creativity tests, nominations, and portfolios) each contribute unique strengths to the gifted identification process.

(i) Ability tests provide a standardized, quantifiable measure of cognitive potential but are vulnerable to cultural bias and ceiling effects (Ford & Harmon, 2001; Worrell & Erwin, 2011).
(ii) Achievement tests assess mastery of learned content and readiness for advanced material, especially when above-level testing is used, but may fail to capture broader intellectual capabilities or non-academic strengths (Warne, 2012).
(iii) Creativity tests broaden the definition of giftedness to include innovation and divergent thinking, though scoring subjectivity and cultural interpretations require careful consideration (Luria *et al*., 2016).

DOI: https://doi.org/10.17509/ijcsne.v6i1.89074
p- ISSN 2775-8400 e- ISSN 2775-9857

(iv) Nominations offer context-rich insights from multiple perspectives but can be inconsistent without clear criteria and training (McBee *et al*., 2016).
(v) Portfolios provide authentic, longitudinal evidence of learning and growth, though they demand significant time, resources, and clear rubrics to ensure fairness (Worrell & Erwin, 2011).

No single method is universally sufficient; combining tools can offset individual limitations while amplifying their strengths.

3.7.2. Patterns of underrepresentation in gifted programs

Across categories, a recurring challenge is the underrepresentation of culturally and linguistically diverse (CLD) learners, as well as students from lower socioeconomic backgrounds (Peters, 2022). Traditional reliance on IQ and standardized achievement tests disproportionately excludes these populations, often due to systemic inequities in educational opportunities, language barriers, and test bias (Shaunessy *et al*., 2004).

Evidence suggests that integrating nonverbal ability tests, creativity assessments, and portfolios increases identification rates for underrepresented groups (VanTassel-Baska *et al*., 2007). Similarly, structured nomination processes, combined with teacher training on cultural responsiveness, can reduce false negatives (Peters & Gentry, 2012).

3.7.3. Multi-method and multidisciplinary approaches

A multi-method approach (combining quantitative data (ability and achievement scores) with qualitative evidence (creativity tests, nominations, portfolios)) yields a more holistic understanding of a learner's potential (Hodges *et al*., 2018). Such approaches require multidisciplinary collaboration among psychologists, teachers, administrators, and families. This collaboration ensures that identification decisions consider multiple dimensions of giftedness and contextual factors that might influence performance. The triangulation of evidence reduces reliance on any single measure, thereby increasing both validity and equity in identification outcomes.

3.8. Implications for Practice and Policy

3.8.1. Designing equitable identification systems

For equitable gifted identification, schools and policymakers should design systems that:
(i) Incorporate multiple measures from different categories to capture diverse strengths (Worrell & Erwin, 2011).
(ii) Ensure that assessment tools are culturally and linguistically appropriate, with norming samples that reflect the diversity of the student population (Kūkea Shultz & Englert, 2021).
(iii) Implement universal screening rather than relying solely on teacher or parent nominations, which can introduce bias and limit the candidate pool (Peters, 2022).

Such systems should aim to identify students early and provide ongoing opportunities for reassessment, recognizing that giftedness can emerge over time.

3.8.2. Training and professional development for assessors

The accuracy of gifted identification is heavily dependent on the expertise of those administering and interpreting assessments (Gilmore & Campbell, 2009). Professional development should include:

DOI: https://doi.org/10.17509/ijcsne.v6i1.89074
p- ISSN 2775-8400 e- ISSN 2775-9857

(i) Training in the administration, scoring, and interpretation of both standardized and qualitative measures.
(ii) Awareness of cultural and linguistic factors that may influence performance.
(iii) Skills in recognizing non-traditional forms of giftedness, including creativity, leadership, and socio-emotional strengths.

A cadre of well-trained assessors ensures more consistent, fair, and defensible identification decisions.

3.8.3. Policy recommendations for inclusive gifted education

Policymakers should consider the following strategies to improve the inclusivity and effectiveness of gifted education programs:

(i) Mandate multi-method identification protocols that integrate ability, achievement, creativity, nominations, and portfolios.
(ii) Fund culturally responsive test development to address bias in existing measures.
(iii) Support research on alternative identification methods, including dynamic assessment and performance-based tasks.
(iv) Establish monitoring systems to track the demographic composition of gifted programs and address disparities.

Such policies align with equity-focused educational goals, ensuring that gifted education is not limited to a narrow segment of the student population.

3.8.4. Long-term impact and future directions

A comprehensive, equitable identification system benefits not only individual students but also society at large. By recognizing and nurturing diverse forms of giftedness, schools can develop future innovators, leaders, and problem-solvers across all sectors (Renzulli, 1999; Sternberg, 2009).

Future research should explore technology-enhanced assessment, such as AI-driven adaptive testing, and the integration of real-world problem-solving tasks to better capture 21st-century competencies. Longitudinal studies are also needed to assess the long-term outcomes of students identified through multi-method approaches.

4. CONCLUSION

The identification of gifted and talented learners is a complex and multifaceted process that demands a balanced integration of quantitative and qualitative approaches. This review synthesized evidence on five major categories of assessment tools (ability tests, achievement tests, creativity tests, nominations, and portfolios), each offering unique strengths and facing specific limitations. The analysis highlighted that no single tool is sufficient for capturing the full spectrum of giftedness; rather, a multi-method, multidisciplinary approach is essential to ensure validity, fairness, and inclusivity.

Persistent challenges such as cultural and linguistic bias, ceiling effects, and inconsistent assessor expertise contribute to the underrepresentation of culturally and linguistically diverse learners in gifted programs. Strategies to address these issues include the incorporation of culturally responsive assessments, universal screening, structured nomination processes, and the systematic use of authentic performance-based measures.

Ultimately, equitable identification systems require not only comprehensive assessment frameworks but also sustained policy support, professional development for assessors, and ongoing research into innovative assessment methodologies. Such a holistic, well-informed

DOI: https://doi.org/10.17509/ijcsne.v6i1.89074
p- ISSN 2775-8400 e- ISSN 2775-9857

approach ensures that gifted education fulfills its role in recognizing and nurturing diverse talents, thereby maximizing individual potential and contributing to societal advancement.

5. AUTHORS' NOTE

The authors declare that there is no conflict of interest regarding the publication of this article. Authors confirmed that the paper was free of plagiarism.

6. REFERENCES

Abu-Hamour, B., Al Hmouz, H., Mattar, J., and Muhaidat, M. (2012). The use of Woodcock-Johnson tests for identifying students with special needs-a comprehensive literature review. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, *47*, 665-673.

Acar, S., Sen, S., and Cayirdag, N. (2016). Consistency of the performance and nonperformance methods in gifted identification: A multilevel meta-analytic review. *Gifted Child Quarterly*, *60*(2), 81-101.

Alfaiz, F. S., Pease, R., and Maker, C. J. (2020). Culturally responsive assessment of physical science skills and abilities: Development, field testing, implementation, and results. *Journal of Advanced Academics*, *31*(3), 298-328.

Brown, S. W., Renzulli, J. S., Gubbins, E. J., Siegle, D., Zhang, W., and Chen, C. H. (2005). Assumptions underlying the identification of gifted and talented students. *Gifted child quarterly*, *49*(1), 68-79.

Brulles, D., and Winebrenner, S. (2011). The schoolwide cluster grouping model: Restructuring gifted education services for the 21st century. *Gifted Child Today*, *34*(4), 35-46.

Callahan, C. M., Azano, A., Park, S., Brodersen, A. V., Caughey, M., and Dmitrieva, S. (2022). Consequences of implementing curricular-aligned strategies for identifying rural gifted students. *Gifted Child Quarterly*, *66*(4), 243-265.

Cao, T. H., Jung, J. Y., and Lee, J. (2017). Assessment in gifted education: A review of the literature from 2005 to 2016. *Journal of Advanced Academics*, *28*(3), 163-203.

Cao, T. H., Jung, J. Y., and Lee, J. (2017). Assessment in gifted education: A review of the literature from 2005 to 2016. *Journal of Advanced Academics*, *28*(3), 163-203.

Carman, C. A., Walther, C. A., and Bartsch, R. A. (2020). Differences in using the Cognitive Abilities Test (CogAT) 7 nonverbal battery versus the Naglieri Nonverbal Ability Test (NNAT) 2 to identify the gifted/talented. *Gifted Child Quarterly*, *64*(3), 171-191.

Coronado-Hijón, A. (2015). Aplicación Contextualizada Del Test De Pensamiento Creativo De Tor Rance (TTCT). *Revista española de orientación y psicopedagogía*, *26*(1), 70-82.

Cropley, A. J. (1996). Recognizing creative potential: An evaluation of the usefulness of creativity tests. *High Ability Studies*, *7*(2), 203-219.

Farahian, M., and Avarzamani, F. (2018). The impact of portfolio on EFL learners' metacognition and writing performance. *Cogent Education*, *5*(1), 1450918.

DOI: https://doi.org/10.17509/ijcsne.v6i1.89074
p- ISSN 2775-8400 e- ISSN 2775-9857

Ford, D. Y., and Harmon, D. A. (2001). Equity and excellence: Providing access to gifted education for culturally diverse students. *Journal of Secondary Gifted Education*, *12*(3), 141-147.

Frost, M. H., Reeve, B. B., Liepa, A. M., Stauffer, J. W., Hays, R. D., and Mayo/FDA Patient-Reported Outcomes Consensus Meeting Group. (2007). What is sufficient evidence for the reliability and validity of patient-reported outcome measures?. *Value in Health*, *10*, S94-S105.

Gilmore, L., and Campbell, M. (2009). Competence in intelligence testing: a training model for postgraduate psychology students. *The Educational and Developmental Psychologist*, *26*(2), 165-173.

Hadaway, N., and Marek-Schroer, M. F. (1992). Multidimensional assessment of the gifted minority student. *Roeper Review*, *15*(2), 73-77.

Hanif, M., Khan, T. A., Masroor, U., and Amjad, A. (2017). Development of online RAW achievement battery test for primary level. *Cogent Education*, *4*(1), 1290332.

Hodges, J., Tay, J., Maeda, Y., and Gentry, M. (2018). A meta-analysis of gifted and talented identification practices. *Gifted child quarterly*, *62*(2), 147-174.

Kaufman, J. C., Plucker, J. A., and Russell, C. M. (2012). Identifying and assessing creativity as a component of giftedness. *Journal of Psychoeducational Assessment*, *30*(1), 60-73.

Kettler, T., and Bower, J. (2017). Measuring creative capacity in gifted students: Comparing teacher ratings and student products. *Gifted Child Quarterly*, *61*(4), 290-299.

Kūkea Shultz, P., and Englert, K. (2021, July). Cultural validity as foundational to assessment development: An indigenous example. In *Frontiers in Education*, *6*, 701973.

Larroder, A., and Ogawa, M. (2015). The development of a self-evaluation checklist for measuring Filipino students' science giftedness. *Asia-Pacific Science Education*, *1*(1), 1-20.

Lee, C. S., Huggins, A. C., and Therriault, D. J. (2014). A measure of creativity or intelligence? Examining internal and external structure validity evidence of the remote associates test. *Psychology of Aesthetics, Creativity, and the Arts*, *8*(4), 446.

Long, H., Kerr, B. A., Emler, T. E., and Birdnow, M. (2022). A critical review of assessments of creativity in education. *Review of Research in Education*, *46*(1), 288-323.

Luria, S. R., O'Brien, R. L., and Kaufman, J. C. (2016). Creativity in gifted identification: Increasing accuracy and diversity. *Annals of the New York Academy of Sciences*, *1377*(1), 44-52.

Noor, B. (2023). Pressure and perfectionism: A phenomenological study on parents' and teachers' perceptions of the challenges faced by gifted and talented students in self-contained classes. In *Frontiers in Education*, *8*, 1225623.

Oak, E., Viezel, K. D., Dumont, R., AND Willis, J. (2019). Wechsler administration and scoring errors made by graduate students and school psychologists. *Journal of Psychoeducational Assessment*, *37*(6), 679-691.

DOI: https://doi.org/10.17509/ijcsne.v6i1.89074
p- ISSN 2775-8400 e- ISSN 2775-9857

Peters, S. J. (2022). The challenges of achieving equity within public school gifted and talented programs. *Gifted Child Quarterly*, *66*(2), 82-94.

Peters, S. J. (2022). The challenges of achieving equity within public school gifted and talented programs. *Gifted Child Quarterly*, *66*(2), 82-94.

Peters, S. J., and Gentry, M. (2012). Group-specific norms and teacher-rating scales: Implications for underrepresentation. *Journal of Advanced Academics*, *23*(2), 125-144.

Pfeiffer, S. I. (2012). Current perspectives on the identification and assessment of gifted students. *Journal of Psychoeducational Assessment*, *30*(1), 3-9.

Rambo-Hernandez, K. E., and Warne, R. T. (2015). Measuring the outliers: An introduction to out-of-level testing with high-achieving students. *Teaching Exceptional Children*, *47*(4), 199-207.

Renzulli, J. S. (1999). What is this thing called giftedness, and how do we develop it? A twenty-five year perspective. *Journal for the Education of the Gifted*, *23*(1), 3-54.

Saadu, U.T., Obafemi, K.E., and Oluwakemi, A.C. (2024). Primary school teachers' competence level in the early identification of gifted children. *Indonesian Journal of Community and Special Needs Education*, *4*(1), 1-10.

Scheiber, C. (2016). Do the Kaufman tests of cognitive ability and academic achievement display construct bias across a representative sample of Black, Hispanic, and Caucasian school-age children in grades 1 through 12?. *Psychological Assessment*, *28*(8), 942.

Shaunessy, E., Karnes, F. A., and Cobb, Y. (2004). Assessing potentially gifted students from lower socioeconomic status with nonverbal measures of intelligence. *Perceptual and Motor Skills*, *98*(3_suppl), 1129-1138.

Staus, N. L., O'Connell, K., and Storksdieck, M. (2021, July). Addressing the ceiling effect when assessing STEM out-of-school time experiences. In *Frontiers in Education*, *6*, 690431.

Sternberg, R. J. (2010). Assessment of gifted students for identification purposes: New techniques for a new millennium. *Learning and Individual Differences*, *20*(4), 327-336.

Torrance, E. P. (1984). The role of creativity in identification of the gifted and talented. *Gifted Child Quarterly*, *28*(4), 153-156.

Van den Berg, Y. H., Lansu, T. A., and Cillessen, A. H. (2015). Measuring social status and social behavior with peer and teacher nomination methods. *Social Development*, *24*(4), 815-832.

VanTassel-Baska, J. (2001). Assessment of gifted student learning in the language arts. *Journal of Secondary Gifted Education*, *13*(2), 67-72.

Warne, R. T. (2012). History and development of above-level testing of the gifted. *Roeper Review*, *34*(3), 183-193.

Wellisch, M., and Brown, J. (2012). An integrated identification and intervention model for intellectually gifted children. *Journal of Advanced Academics*, *23*(2), 145-167.

DOI: https://doi.org/10.17509/ijcsne.v6i1.89074
p- ISSN 2775-8400 e- ISSN 2775-9857

Worrell, F. C., and Erwin, J. O. (2011). Best practices in identifying students for gifted and talented education programs. *Journal of Applied School Psychology*, *27*(4), 319-340.

Wright, L., and Borland, J. H. (1993). Using early childhood developmental portfolios in the identification and education of young, economically disadvantaged, potentially gifted students. *Roeper Review*, *15*(4), 205-210.

Yassin, S. F. M., Ishak, N. M., Yunus, M. M., and Abd Majid, R. (2012). The identification of gifted and talented students. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, *55*, 585-593.

Zimmerman, B. J., and Dibenedetto, M. K. (2008). Mastery learning and assessment: Implications for students and teachers in an era of high-stakes testing. *Psychology in the Schools*, *45*(3), 206-216.

DOI: https://doi.org/10.17509/ijcsne.v6i1.89074
p- ISSN 2775-8400 e- ISSN 2775-9857