

Nurturing brilliance: A cross-cultural exploration of supporting gifted children



Abdulelah Abdullah Al-Duraywish *

Applied College, King Faisal University, Al-Ahsa 31982, Saudi Arabia

ARTICLE INFO

Article history:

Received 8 June 2023

Received in revised form

27 September 2023

Accepted 1 November 2023

Keywords:

Policies and legislation

Gifted education

Comparative analysis

Gifted standards

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study is to examine the available laws and regulations regarding the education of gifted students by comparing these laws and regulations in Australia, South Korea, Saudi Arabia, and the United Arab Emirates. The study used the descriptive analytical comparative approach and analyzed available information in published studies, peer-reviewed articles, and online official documents of the countries under study. The findings of the study reported that Australia is very advanced in the field of enacting policies and legislation, as it has developed integrated strategies that include most of the elements of policies and legislation, although there are some shortcomings compared to the international standards; in South Korea, there are policies and legislation, but they are not integrated and have many shortcomings in definitions, explanation and implementation, and they do not cooperate with the international standards. In Saudi Arabia and the UAE, the implementation of policies and legislation is neither in line with international standards nor with the general directions of educational policies, and they are almost unavailable. However, the UAE has taken some steps to enact policies and laws.

© 2023 The Authors. Published by IASE. This is an open access article under the CC BY-NC-ND license (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/>).

1. Introduction

The field of gifted care has received many efforts aimed at developing the area of talent for achieving the highest standards in a way that enables the discovery and development of the skills of individuals for the best benefit of societies (Subotnik et al., 2011). However, policies' formation and development for gifted differ from one country to another based on economic, cultural, political, and other factors (Mandelman et al., 2010). The developed and developing countries have endeavored to improve work in various fields, especially the field of education, and this, in turn, requires the enacting of appropriate policies and legislation. Despite the different orientations, philosophies, and cultures around the globe, countries enact policies and set educational legislation that is commensurate with these roles as they see fit their needs. Still, these policies and legislation are absent in many countries from the

field of gifted care practices. Aljughaiman and Grigorenko (2013) stated that any subsystem in gifted education must be understood in the context of the general education system and the society it serves. Roberts et al. (2015) mentioned that although legislation and policies in the field of the gifted represent the main ground and rules that lead to proper implementation and are in line with the country's goals, they are absent from many actual practices or applied with significant shortcomings. The lack and the inadequacy of such legislation and policies usually lead to situations being dealt with on a case-by-case basis or ignored. Stephens (2011) confirmed that the absence of clear, specific, and comprehensive policies and legislation for gifted care has diverted attention away from developing exceptional talents towards a minimum level of global competence and being lenient in serving them optimally. The level of absence of policies and legislation related to the gifted has varied in terms of deficiencies and absences. Brown et al. (2006) argued that if policies and legislation are deficient or absent, they are more absent and deficient in some elements and strategies related to the gifted, including those related to the acceleration of policies for gifted students.

In Arab Gulf countries, several studies have come out with results that emphasized the importance of periodically reviewing the educational policies in

* Corresponding Author.

Email Address: aalduraywish@kfu.edu.sa

<https://doi.org/10.21833/ijaas.2023.11.016>

Corresponding author's ORCID profile:

<https://orcid.org/0000-0002-4119-488X>

2313-626X/© 2023 The Authors. Published by IASE.

This is an open access article under the CC BY-NC-ND license

(<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/>)

general (Alshebami et al., 2022), developing entrepreneurial education (Alshebami et al., 2020) and also focusing more on gifted education policies to set them in light of global trends, scientific progress and research in the field of gifted students to ensure developing educational programs capable of producing the necessary skills for individuals. Moreover, it emphasizes the need to develop legislation to activate regional and international cooperation and unify terminology, standards, and procedures in identifying and caring for gifted students. Several studies have referred to policies and legislation for the gifted and their applications in different countries, and some studies have focused on comparing the applications of one country with international standards. One of these studies is the study of Long et al. (2015), where the five-year VanTassel-Baska (2017) model of high-quality gifted education policies was employed in analyzing and evaluating gifted education policies in Hong Kong. The study focused on the nature of the policies implemented in gifted education. It concluded that many weaknesses must be improved concerning policies and management of gifted education. This aligns with the study of Aljughaiman and Grigorenko (2013) which focused on the reality of educational policies related to gifted education programs in the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia. Using a mixed methodology, the study concluded that the procedures associated with the care of the gifted are inappropriate in the three main aspects: policymaking, written and executive policies, and educational policy standards. It also concluded that there were no statistically significant differences due to job, experience, and educational qualification variables.

In Turkey, Özmen and Kömürlü (2013) mentioned that in short-term work, successful educational models have not been developed to meet the requirements of this field. One of the principal challenges in executing educational policies aimed at gifted students lies in the scarcity of laboratory facilities within educational institutions, the obsolescence of library resources, and the inadequate collaboration between centers of scientific and artistic excellence. Furthermore, the selection process for educators catering to gifted individuals has been flawed. Additionally, there is a notable trend of gifted students abandoning their technical and scientific pursuits owing to the pressures associated with placement examinations. VanTassel-Baska (2017) discussed the American policy in the education of the gifted to shed light on the significant shortage in the field of enacting policies for the gifted and suggested examples related to the development of guidelines for the development of low-income students and acceleration as one of the most prominent strategies for the gifted. Using the method of documentary analysis, the study concluded that there are no comprehensive national policies for gifted care in the United States of America, particularly in the field of identification and acceleration. Tackling the

programs of gifted students of two British private schools in Dubai, United Arab Emirates, using the content analysis methodology, Younis (2018) discussed and analyzed the differences and similarities related to talent development through the policies applied in the two schools with the international standards set by VanTassel-Baska (2017). The study concluded that despite the high rating of the two intended schools, the evaluation of the gifted policies applied to them shows that they are not of high quality and insufficient and that they need to appropriately follow international standards for talent policies. In a qualitative study applied to ten schools in Australia, Long et al. (2015) examined the contribution of Australia's revised New South Wales policy for gifted programs. The main findings of this study revealed that the provision of external resources for gifted programs and the student's learning needs directly affected the quality of gifted programs, as there was variation in the implementation of policy reforms related to the type of school (selective, partial, and inclusive) and the time that the gifted program operated in school. Therefore, the relationships between internal knowledge, attitudes, and beliefs with the scope and quality of gifted programs are complex and will require further study, and there are elements influencing the quality and implementation of policies such as external funding sources, monitoring, and the nature of issues related to school diversity.

Many studies have compared the policies and legislation between a group of countries. Long et al. (2015) discussed the concepts of talent, the gifted characteristics, and the services provided. His study also aimed to discover the reality of enacting legislation and policies for the gifted at the level of the Arab world. It came out with a set of results, most notably:

- The lack of adequate and appropriate legislation and policies for the gifted at the level of the Arab world
- The need to enact appropriate laws, taking into account the exchange of experiences between different Arab countries
- Working to standardize curricula at the level of the Arab world

Avcu and Er (2017) analyzed the educational policies for the gifted and their applications in Germany, the Netherlands, Sweden, and Turkey. Using the horizontal and descriptive approach for comparative education, the researchers concluded that there are essential steps, regulations, guidelines, and policies for the education of gifted individuals in Germany, the Netherlands, and Turkey.

In contrast, those regulations and policies were not sufficiently available in Sweden. Likewise, the study by David and Abukari (2018) aimed to compare the policies of gifted and talented education in the Emirates, especially the Abu Dhabi Education Council, with policies in other countries—namely the

United Kingdom, the United States of America, and Australia—by using the State Policy Guide published by the [NAGC \(2019\)](#) as a reference for comparison. The study yielded results, most notably the quality of policies in both the United States and Australia. At the same time, in the United Kingdom, it was less quality and comprehensive, and in the Emirates, it came in a way that was not promising and did not represent aspirations. [Rasmussen and Lingard \(2018\)](#) addressed the concept of excellence implied by education policies through an experimental analysis approach that targeted documents related to education policies in Denmark, England, and Australia. One of the most prominent results of the study was that the policies behind the Danish talent development strategy are based on a one-dimensional, limited, psychological, and individual understanding but not social, cultural, or genetic one; in England, the political motives for excellence in education were expressed as a necessity to provide possibilities for those who are gifted rather than providing them for all. The Australian experience was more mature and oriented in services and programs based on specific policies.

Accordingly, despite the belief in the necessity of striving towards the implementation of best practices that would contribute effectively to the care of the gifted in a comprehensive manner for all operations falling within this goal, the reality shown by the results of various studies confirms that the local policies and legislation followed in the countries are often absent. [Aljughaiman and Grigorenko \(2013\)](#) demonstrated that many problems that lead to wasting talent stem from the lack of appropriate policies and legislation that meet gifted children's needs, distinctive abilities, and learning individuality. The development of specific policies for the gifted that ensure maximum utilization of the capabilities of the gifted is critical ([Tomlinson, 2008](#)), and the variation and diversity of approaches and legislation related to the gifted and their shortcomings and lack of coverage have led to a difference in the levels of care and its results, as well as an undesirable diversity in different experiences ([Garrett and Rubie-Davies, 2014](#)). Despite the availability of policies and legislation related to the gifted in many countries, these policies and legislation are still controversial and have many shortcomings. [Hu \(2019\)](#) stressed the urgent need to make more amendments to existing policies and legislation and enact new policies to improve the quality of learning for effective implementation of gifted care to issue policies and legislation that support gifted students' right to early intervention and to reconsider adopting newer models for gifted students' care that are compatible with the results of recent research in the field of gifted education. It is also important to realize that policies must be enacted within the cultural context, then provide time for application and practice of these policies, and then followed by consideration of their impact on policies and standards, and finally, review of those policies at regular intervals, making sure that

they are available to all ([Cao et al., 2017](#)). If the situation concerning gifted people suffers from deficiencies in policies and legislation, then the problem with people with special needs of all kinds is more deficient and more in a condition of achieving equal opportunities authentically ([Stopper, 2013](#)). The premise of this study is based on the importance of enacting policies and legislation related to the field of the gifted and comparing the application of these policies in several different countries with what can benefit from such application in the local community. Therefore, [David and Abukari \(2018\)](#) emphasized that the desire to learn from the experiences of others is a driving force for policy dissemination. The study aims to answer the following questions based on the above discussion.

1. What are the essential policies, legislation, and laws related to the care of gifted children in some non-Arab countries (Australia and South Korea) and some Arab countries (Saudi Arabia and the United Arab Emirates)?
2. To what extent are policies, legislation, and laws related to the care of gifted children in the selected countries compatible with international standards?
3. How can it benefit from the different experiences of the four countries (Australia, South Korea, Saudi Arabia, and the United Arab Emirates) in policies, legislation, and laws for gifted children?

In conclusion, this study will provide insight into the gifted field and a slew of recommendations for policymakers in the study contexts.

2. Aim of the study

It is through exploring studies that dealt with the most prominent needs of the gifted and the most urgent requirements in the field of giftedness, in addition to the various panel discussions of specialists in the field of caring for the gifted, all these leads to confirm the reality of the problem of deficiencies in enact policies and legislation for the gifted. Moreover, there is a lack of studies in this field. [Heuser et al. \(2017\)](#) confirmed that there is a significant shortage and relative absence of studies related to international policies for gifted education. Accordingly, the main objectives of the study are specified as follows:

1. Identifying the policies, legislation, and laws for the care and education of gifted children in some foreign non-Arab (Australia, and South Korea), and in some Arab countries (Saudi Arabia, the United Arab Emirates).
2. Determining the compatibility of policies, legislation, and laws related to the care of gifted children in the selected countries with international standards in?
3. Proposing the most prominent ways to benefit from the policies, legislation, and laws related to

the care and education of gifted children in the selected countries in the local community.

3. Literature review

3.1. The importance of policies and legislation for gifted children

The enactment of policies and legislation for the gifted at the state level is of great importance, as it guarantees standardization of procedures, fairness of work, clarity of operations, and uniformity of application. Gifted education policies represent a critical process (Younis, 2018), and there is a great need to develop policies and legislation emanating from the educational philosophy in the country when developing special programs for the gifted. A group of elements confirms the importance of establishing policies and legislation for the gifted and the need for it. This includes achieving the specific goals including finding the interdependence between elements that form the basis for creating student academic opportunities. Enacting policies is one of the only ways to build stable and consistent support systems for gifted students (Gallagher, 2006). The foreseeable reality confirms that there is a strong relationship between the goal of countries to be able to compete economically and their policies related to the education of gifted individuals (Avcu and Er, 2017). This also includes attempts to raise educational standards, especially in the field of the gifted, with the best and fairest practices (Rasmussen and Lingard, 2018) and equate excellence with elitism (Brady, 2015). The importance of such legislation and policies may vary according to the concerned, such as the marginalized groups of gifted ordinary people or gifted people with disabilities (Pereira et al., 2015). This need multiplies at the level of the Arab world due to the relatively recent experience and the level of shortcomings in it.

The recommendations of the First International Conference on Giftedness and Creativity organized in Riyadh stressed the importance of approving policies, regulations, and legislation that guarantee the rights of gifted people to receive an education appropriate to their abilities and enable the promotion and strengthening of the roles of various organizations concerned with nurturing talent, emphasizing the importance of nurturing talent and creativity to optimally invest the most critical category in human capital. On the other hand, it must be stated that there is another point of view that reduces the importance of policies and legislation for the gifted (Leu et al., 2021), where there is a difference in the opinions of experts regarding the need for specific legislation and policies for the gifted. However, this depends on a set of factors that must be implemented and particular to each country, including the effectiveness of the current unspecified legislations/policies, their protection and support, and how there are specific legislations so that the policy fits with what is already in place. However,

Long et al. (2015) confirmed that there is ample evidence of the positive impact of policy-making on the gifted at school. David and Abukari (2018) also stated that the importance of learning policies for gifted care is entirely coherent. It has been shown through the results of the studies that the effect of enacting policies and legislation in the field of gifted care is of clear significance and that the difference in the impact of those policies and legislations between countries depends on a set of factors, the most prominent of which is the mechanism of the application according to each country.

3.2. Standards and components of policies and legislation for gifted children

The American National Association for Gifted Children (NAGC, 2019) Programming Standards for Pre-K-12 Gifted are helpful because they provide clear guidance about expected outcomes and evidence-based practices in learning and development, assessment, curriculum planning, instruction, and professional development and learning environments (VanTassel-Baska, 2017). Nevertheless, these standards represent a significant imprint on the enactment of appropriate standards for drawing up the policies and legislations of countries; they were issued in 2007 after a comprehensive survey of countries' applications for caring for the gifted. However, these standards of policies and legislation are not sufficiently integrated to be relied upon as a general criterion (David and Abukari, 2018). Many researchers have developed a set of standards that control policies and legislations, and the most prominent of these is what is generated by VanTassel-Baska (2017), under the title "The Five Characteristics of High-Quality Talent Policies" (Younis, 2018). The additions made by Purcell and Eckert (2006) are also considered valuable to what Ninkov (2020) addressed. Gifted education policies and legislations are represented by elements with direct and indirect effectiveness and impact on gifted children, and gifted education policies are linked by rules to laws and regulations by legislative councils (VanTassel-Baska, 2017).

Aljughaiman and Grigorenko (2013) stated that, in general, there are four primary sources for establishing and implementing policies related to gifted children. Firstly, legislation, which means the set of legislation adopted by governments that ensures the provision of various types of support to programs and research centers specialized in talent, and secondly, the relevant official authorities that issue decisions. The third and fourth included the administrative rules, which are related to the provision of primary and general guidelines and laws in detail that can be applied in schools and professional standards related to the specifications of those responsible for the education of the gifted and their professional development. Gubbins et al. (2021) stated that the policies and legislation for the gifted include four main pillars: identification, intervention, infrastructure, resources, and results.

Brown and Garland (2015) stated that the four policy questions for giftedness are: Who will receive the resources? What resources will be delivered? What are the conditions under which the resources are provided? Who provides the resources? According to Long et al. (2015), these policies and legislation are based on identification, policy philosophy, budgets, professional development, and evaluation.

Many countries have adopted different perceptions and orientations of legislation and policies related to the Gifted based on several cultural elements in the first place, and accordingly, the countries differed in their legislation and policies related to the gifted (Heuser et al., 2017). These policies and legislative measures must encompass all aspects pertinent to the domain of gifted care. This includes the provision of apt guidance and support across all educational levels, extending to university education. Furthermore, they should address the diverse spectrum of gifted individuals, ranging from those with conventional talents to those possessing exceptional abilities (Kipkoech et al., 2011). It should also have health legislation and create a real psychological education for all students. The policies

and legislation for talented people must align with global values and principles. Taking into account that gifted education curricula are rarely static but rather undergo significant transformations over the decades. There are differences within educational systems in terms of their perceptions, policies, and practices related to gifted education (Heuser et al., 2017), and they differ between countries and states in one country regarding their principles, definitions, and application. Developing policies and legislation within the social and educational policy of gifted students is also essential. Therefore, this leads to allocating appropriate resources for educational programs (Gallagher, 2015). VanTassel-Baska (2017) emphasized that identification procedures are necessary for establishing policies and enacting legislation. The problems of defining policies and legislation for the gifted begin from the definition of the gifted themselves (Brady, 2015). Through the integration of various sources of policies and legislation according to the NAGC (2019) and the results of a number of studies, it is possible to come up with a detailed schedule of policies and legislation for talented people as presented in Table 1.

Table 1: Standards of gifted policies and legislation

Standard	Contents
Main premises	Rationale philosophy Goals
Selection policies	Inclusive of all categories Based on the diversity and comprehensiveness of recognition and discovery mechanisms Maintain justice, fairness, and equal opportunities Comprehensive and developed curricula with quality Clear, easy to understand and interpret Covering all specified components Connected and logically connected Policy actions are feasible and applicable The program management system defines nominations, identification procedures, objectives, and expected outcomes for each program
Intervention policies	Based on research and best practices in the educational field Clearly define the policy premise and objectives The presence of differentiation in the curriculum fulfills all the students' needs. The rationale for each component therein The policy defines different programming options for schools and districts The need to develop comprehensive and diversified extension policies Clear assembly mechanism
Professional development policies	Meet the minimum qualification specifications for teachers Preparing professional staff Clear policies and plans for professional development Preparing leaders for the process of caring for the talented
Evaluation policy	The programming options match the evaluation tool Effective, diverse, and multiple assessment methods
Policies of openness to society	Environment, family, and community in terms of participation and roles Awareness and development Various sources of funding
Infrastructure and resources	Specific and adequate budgets Full transparency Scientific research support policies

3.3. The problems of building policies and legislation for the gifted children

The process of building policies and legislation for the gifted is surrounded by a set of problems and shrouded in various obstacles. David and Abukari (2018) emphasized that policy formulation is a complex process in which multiple factors play

diverse and changing roles. It is also a challenging and complicated process requiring considerable changes in the organization, curriculum, and school culture (Cao et al., 2017). In general, it can be said that the policies and legislation of the gifted are part of the overall educational system of the country, influenced by its philosophy, starting from its ground and corresponding to its orientations. Consequently,

the construction of policies and legislation for the gifted is subjected to the influence of various factors, whether economic, political, social, etc., which may lead to a real disparity between practices in enacting policies and legislation in different countries. Some studies indicate how the experiences of others influence policymakers and that political interests may severely hinder the adoption of a particular policy. It is also affected by various circumstances, including local capability—teachers' experience and curriculum quality—and the will—attitudes, motives, and beliefs of stakeholders (Long et al., 2015).

Moreover, there is a problem related to the vast gap between the construction of policies and legislation and their practical application (VanTassel-Baska, 2017). Swanson and Lord (2016) reported that the literature on gifted education lacks convincing evidence about the impact of gifted and talented policy, although observations have indicated a positive assessment. Moreover, many researchers have differing views on this opinion in terms of proving the impact of policies and legislation on the talented field, such as VanTassel-Baska (2017), Brady (2015), Aljughaiman and Grigorenko (2013), and others. However, this problem may be one of the problems of the need for more direction of countries towards enacting policies and legislation for the gifted.

3.4. The reality of policies and legislation worldwide

Despite the significant progress in gifted education, policies and legislation are still absent in many countries, especially America (VanTassel-Baska, 2017), and talented institutions suffer from the lack of clear policies and sufficiently specific legislation. Despite multiple attempts to enact policies and legislation, all these attempts and applications are considered promising in this area (Özmen and Kömürlü, 2013). There is also a problem related to the difference between the enactment of policies and legislation and their practical application; for example, the existing policies often do not target low-income people (VanTassel-Baska, 2017), and the applications of policies differ from their enactments, such as the enactment of budget and spending policies and the difference in their application between cities and countryside, etc. Aljughaiman and Grigorenko (2013) stated that there is a big difference between the existence of written policies and the implementation of those policies. There is still a vacuum in analyzing the gifted and talented education policy (Jolly and Robins, 2021). The reality shows that the beneficiaries of these policies are the elite groups at the expense of the poor and marginalized. There is still a wrong division between educating everyone at the same level and helping each student to progress as much as possible, which requires the development of clear policies and legislation for the gifted. It is essential to realize that when comparing

policies and legislation and their application between countries, the different trends should be ultimately discovered based on identity and its consequences (Brown and Garland, 2015). There are no clearly defined policies, especially in the university field in most universities. Therefore, developing policies and legislation should start with regular classes for teachers so that they can identify talented students early, which unfortunately does not exist. Aljughaiman and Grigorenko (2013) stated that few policies, legislations, and regulations are necessary to organize work in gifted care. Long et al. (2015) reported that through reviewing literature at the level of the Arab world, it can be said that researchers were unable to find legal care in its proper form for the gifted in the Arab world as a whole, except for some various legislations that establish schools for the gifted, prepare them, and prepare teachers who teach them. The significant lack of enactment of policies and legislation for the gifted was not limited to the systems in the countries but instead extended to studies and research dealing with this topic, as confirmed by Heuser et al. (2017), who report that there is a significant shortage in the field of studies related to international policies for the education of the gifted.

4. Methodology

4.1. Nature of the study

The study used the descriptive analytical-comparative method to ensure that the study's objectives were reached appropriately. It is a method that analyzes phenomena and then combines them to find points of differentiation and similarity. This type of analysis consists of the systematic use of observations extracted from two or more aggregate units (countries, societies, systems, organizations, cultures, etc.) or from two or more phases from the history of a particular community. The study was based on secondary information collected from various sources such as published studies, articles in peer-reviewed scientific journals, and official documents available online on the websites of ministries and institutions related to talent in the four countries mentioned.

4.2. Context of the study selection

By comprehensively tracking the process of caring for the gifted in several countries, the four countries mentioned earlier have been selected for this study for the following reasons. First, The Australian experience represented a distinctive experience in generally gifted care and policy enactment. In this regard, David and Abukari (2018) mentioned that the Australian document included most of the policy elements required in the education of the gifted. Second, The Korean experience as a whole is good in enacting policies to care for the gifted, although it suffers from various

shortcomings (Kim et al., 2020). Korea's efforts in gifted education, in general, deserve to be better known and celebrated, and there is continued international interest in Korean education in general, as a direct result of the country's exceptional performance in science, mathematics, and available knowledge assessments (Kang, 2019). Thirdly, The United Arab Emirates represents one of the emerging countries in caring for the gifted, which has begun to adopt some policies for the gifted (David and Abukari, 2018). Finally, Saudi Arabia is considered one of the countries that have made great strides in gifted care. Aljughaiman and Grigorenko (2013) confirmed that the growth of the gifted field in Saudi Arabia is promising and distinguished. Despite its relatively delayed inception, the Saudi Arabian approach to gifted care has demonstrated considerable advancement (Alfaiz et al., 2022). In addition, one of the reasons for choosing Saudi Arabia is that it is the target country in this study in terms of the possibility of benefiting from the diverse experiences of different countries in its application. The four selected countries represent a kind of blending between advanced countries in the field and developed ones with geographical and ideological diversity, which gives the study a more distinct dimension in comparative studies.

4.3. Study instrument

To achieve the study's objectives, a tool was designed for comparing policies and legislations in the selected countries after referring to standards such as NAGC (2019) standards, the standards set by VanTassel-Baska (2017), Purcell and Eckert (2006), and others. The study tool consists of eight sections: identification, regulatory legislation, detection and identification, gifted services, professional development, evaluation, special categories, and family and community relations. The tool is sent to seven specialists to take their opinions and suggestions, and after taking the most critical developmental notes, the tool is adopted in its final form.

5. Results and discussion

To answer the first question, which states: What are the essential policies, legislations, and laws related to the care of gifted children in some non-Arab countries (Australia, South Korea) and some Arab countries (Saudi Arabia, the United Arab Emirates)? The obtained results can be presented in Table 2.

Table 2: Results

	Australia			South Korea			Saudi Arabia			UAE		
	a	b	c	a	b	c	a	b	c	a	b	c
First section: Identity identification												
Accuracy in selection	✓				✓							✓
Inclusion		✓				✓					✓	✓
Second section: Regulatory legislation												
Transparency	✓					✓					✓	✓
Administrative rules	✓					✓					✓	✓
Third section: Detecting and identifying the gifted												
Methods	✓				✓			✓				✓
Domains	✓				✓			✓				✓
Fourth section gifted services												
Acceleration	✓				✓						✓	✓
Enrichment	✓				✓						✓	✓
Guidance		✓				✓					✓	✓
Fifth section: Professional development												
Criteria for employment	✓				✓						✓	✓
Development	✓				✓						✓	✓
Sixth section: Evaluation												
Types	✓				✓						✓	✓
Mechanism	✓				✓						✓	✓
Seventh section: Special categories												
Inclusivity		✓				✓					✓	✓
Means of detection	✓					✓					✓	✓
Care programs		✓				✓					✓	✓
Eighth section: The family and society relationship												
The family role		✓				✓					✓	✓
Societal role		✓				✓					✓	✓

a: Verified; b: To some extent; c: Not verified

The study's results represent convergence in points and divergence in other issues. The results show, in general, that there is a real problem in enacting policies and legislation for countries, especially in the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia and the UAE. The study results also show that Australia has developed policies and legislation for talented students in an advanced manner, with some shortcomings that could be improved. At the same time, South Korea has established several particular

policies and legislations, but it has many drawbacks. Saudi Arabia and the UAE are developing policies and legislation very late, and there are only a few unclear policies and legislation for talented people that are hardly noticed. The study results have shown that although identification is the first premise on which the following pillars related to the care of the gifted are established, the identification level has not been achieved in the Emirates. This aligns with David and Abukari (2018) that there is a

lack of clear identification in the Emirates. It is also the reality in Saudi Arabia and South Korea, where identification is not integrated and comprehensive, while it is clear and complete in Australia. This is consistent with [Rasmussen and Lingard \(2018\)](#) that Australia accurately, appropriately, and comprehensively identified the required identity and the definition based on it. [Rasmussen and Lingard \(2018\)](#) have reported that the concept of multi-talent is one of the most prominent features of Australian policies; in contrast, [Slater \(2018\)](#) has stated that historically, Australia lacks a consistent approach to identifying gifted children, which is also shown in this study that there is a lack of identification in Australian policies related to particular categories. Still, in other areas, it is complementary.

In the field of regulatory legislation, the lack of transparency in South Korea, the UAE, and Saudi Arabia represents a negative point in this area, and this is consistent with the results of a study conducted by [ECSSR \(2018\)](#) reporting a lack of transparency and disclosure, especially in support and budgets, while it is available in Australia. The study results have found that Australia has created clear administrative rules and complementary legislation regarding organizational practices and procedures. In contrast, those administrative rules and legislation do not exist in the remaining three countries. The results show that the official systems in South Korea, the UAE, and Saudi Arabia are not comprehensive and have not been developed for many years. Moreover, support oscillates between absenteeism and unfairness in its disbursement and distribution.

Regarding policies in detecting and identifying talented people, Australia has advanced by creating clear and varied policies and legislation. At the same time, South Korea, the United Arab Emirates, and Saudi Arabia are often limited to some methods that do not comprehensively detect talented people in various fields of talent and do not stipulate essential points related to the diversity of detection methods and their mechanism, etc. This is consistent with the [Alfaiz et al. \(2022\)](#) study findings that early detection and tools for its application still need to be revised in Saudi Arabia.

As for the policies related to the services provided to the gifted, acceleration programs are absent in Korea, the UAE, and Saudi Arabia, and despite their presence in Australia, there are shortcomings; this is consistent with the result of the [Lupkowski-Shoplik et al. \(2022\)](#) study, reporting a significant weakness of the gifted acceleration policies on various types of acceleration. In the enrichment field, the Australian experience is clearly defined in policies and legislation, and the South Korean experience comes with some relative progress. At the same time, it is almost absent in Saudi Arabia and the UAE. At the level of counseling, policies, and legislation related to academic counseling exist but are insufficient in Australia. At the same time, there were no policies and legislation

in the other three countries except for some references related to some practices for exceptional cases. This is consistent with [McClain and Pfeiffer \(2012\)](#), that, in general, in this area, most counseling processes were limited to counseling students with difficulties, with a complete omission of the rest of the types of counseling. As for psychological, emotional, and vocational guidance, there is, to some extent absence in its policies and legislations in South Korea, the UAE, and Saudi Arabia, with a better situation in Australia, but also with significant shortcomings, and this is consistent with the conclusion of [Alfaiz et al. \(2022\)](#) that there is a substantial absence of psychological, social and cultural care and that it is rarely available to the gifted.

Concerning professional development policies, Australia has developed a codified mechanism for the selection of workers in the field of the gifted, and this is consistent with what was confirmed by the Australian Association for the Education of the Gifted and Talented (AAEGT) that there is a provision for selection policies for workers in the field of the gifted. South Korea also has good policies in this field, as confirmed by [ACERGS \(2020\)](#), including the selection of distinguished teachers, the approval of the school principal the request for a teaching license, and the requirement of specific educational levels. As for the UAE and Saudi Arabia, the selection criteria are not available, and the selection is based on complete fieldwork. As for the development of workers in the field of gifted education in terms of policies and legislations related to it, Australia pays attention to the development of workers in the area based on an explicit and written policy, and this is in line with the result concluded by [David and Abukari \(2018\)](#), while it is relatively acceptable in Korea, and almost absent in Saudi Arabia and the UAE.

Regarding the policies and legislation related to the evaluation, despite its importance, it is acceptable with significant shortcomings in Australia and good in Korea, and this is consistent with what is stated by [Kim et al. \(2020\)](#), as there is a comprehensive system for an evaluation in special supplementary education in South Korea, where quantitative and qualitative tools are used. As for Saudi Arabia, it is almost absent, and the results of the [Robbins \(2019\)](#) study confirmed that even with specific criteria for an evaluation in gifted programs, their use is minimal and ineffective.

Policies and legislations related to dual exclusivity are rare worldwide, and very few benefit from them. Legislations and policies related to special categories are primarily absent and unfair in South Korea, the UAE, and Saudi Arabia; while they are well only in Australia, but still, they are still incomplete. This is consistent with what [Rasmussen and Lingard \(2018\)](#) confirmed Australia has made essential steps in enacting policies and legislation for talented people with unique categories.

As for the family and community relationship policies and legislation, they were average in Australia, weak in Korea, and absent in Saudi Arabia

and the UAE, and this is consistent with what was concluded by [Cao et al. \(2017\)](#) regarding the significant lack of parents' awareness of the policies and practices on talented and excellent students, and their knowledge of whom to contact to discuss the needs of their children or their particular needs as parents. The study results generally confirm the real problem in the absence of policies and legislation in the countries, most notably in Saudi Arabia, the UAE, and South Korea. At the same time, Australia's level was advanced, lacking some crucial steps.

Concerning the second question, it is found the following: the policies and legislation in Australia are much more advanced and stipulated, but they are not in line with international standards, as some shortcomings are found and need to be updated, including the deficiencies reported by [Rasmussen and Lingard \(2018\)](#) in achieving justice, especially among the elite groups and others, and reducing the impact on social circles. [David and Abukari \(2020\)](#) confirmed that the Australian document included most of the policy elements but lacked a clear definition of the policy goals, and as stated by [Cao et al. \(2017\)](#) that Australia has made great strides in the formulation and enactment of educational policies for the gifted. Still, it needs to do more, including what is confirmed by [Heuser et al. \(2017\)](#) that policies and legislation in Australia do not achieve justice for minorities and underrepresented groups and what is established that there is a significant loss of Australian policies related to the ideals of double exceptionalism. Moreover, [Jolly and Robins \(2021\)](#) reported that there is still some imbalance in the gifted education policies in Australia, especially concerning special categories.

South Korean applications do not conform to international standards and require significant efforts to achieve the efficiency of those standards. However, the new South Korean national curriculum has been implemented since 2015 and has substantial development in this area ([Hong, 2016](#)). One of the most notable observations on Korean policies is that they focus on the fields of science, technology, mathematics, science, engineering, and the arts, ignoring the rest of the areas, and they do not serve students at the undergraduate level ([Cho and Suh, 2016](#)). The implementation of policies in Saudi Arabia does not comply with international standards and the general trends of educational policies, and this comes in line with [Al-Manqash \(2006\)](#), despite the establishment of some policies in Saudi Arabia that contributed to supporting the care of the gifted. Concerning the Emirates, the results show that policies do not conform to international standards to a considerable extent. This aligns with the results of [Younis's \(2018\)](#) study, that applying policies and legislation for talented people in the UAE is not of the proper quality and is inconsistent with international standards. Therefore, it is crucial to develop policies appropriately and then develop ways to implement the procedures derived from these policies. Although the UAE has begun to

develop policies related to the gifted, there are still significant gaps.

Regarding the third question, it was revealed that after reviewing, analyzing, and commenting on the study results, it is possible to come up with some of the most prominent suggestions through which it is possible to benefit from the experiences of different countries in the local community. Firstly, it is essential to proceed from international standards in constructing domestic policies and legislations, considering the realities of the country, its culture, socio-political, religious background, etc. Secondly, it is necessary to have a policy and legislation document that includes the most important aspects related to the care of the gifted, with the development of a philosophy specific to the objectives of policies and legislations, and this policy and its steps should be written like the Australian experience. It is essential to benefit from the experience of South Korea and its updated national curriculum in 2015, which requires developing updated curricula at relatively frequent intervals. Furthermore, there must be a concerted effort between the school, the family, and the community to create clear, transparent, and accessible policies for all parties. Also, it is essential to start building policies and legislation by defining the identity as inclusive and diverse as found in Australia. Concerning The UAE's experience, we can also benefit from it. It has started to establish policies, albeit weak, but it has made a positive step in this field, which is the hoped-for first step towards integration in the construction of those policies and legislation. Finally, there is a need to clarify that the policies are met to be inclusive for all students, not just the gifted ones so that the curriculum is explicit and avoids the mistake that occurred in South Korea of having public and private policies.

6. Conclusion

This study aimed to understand the essential policies, legislation, and laws related to the care of gifted children in certain selected countries and how society benefits from them. The findings of the study reported exciting results. It is noted that the Australian experience is the most distinctive among the four countries in most areas due to several reasons. At the forefront of these reasons is the educational system emanating from Australia's political system, which is based on accountability. This creates a precise mechanism in the application.

On the other hand, South Korea's experience in policies and legislation is good to some extent and lacks a lot to be acceptable. Perhaps this is because South Korea's educational system supports caring for the talented. Still, at the same time, the quality of the educational system emanating from the political system in South Korea is inflexible, and its mechanism is unsuitable in a way where integration can be found in the construction of policies and legislation. Social and cultural factors also play an important factor in putting pressure on creating such

policies and legislations. Perhaps, the significant progress of South Korea in world competitions and international rankings in the upbringing of the gifted with this shortcoming in the field of policies and legislation is explained as, firstly, South Korea has intensified efforts on students in the area of international competitions, especially in the fields of Science, Mathematics, and language, and for that reason, it has achieved outstanding results in it. Secondly, this is related to the extent of the impact of policies and legislation practices at the level of the gifted. Although the researcher agrees with many researchers who have emphasized the great importance of enacting policies and legislation, it is appropriate to mention the other point of view based on questioning the impact of passing policies and legislation on the actual reality and the real performance of the gifted. Swanson and Lord (2016) argued that the literature on gifted education lacks evidence that there can be clear motives for the existence of policies for the gifted and talented, with the positive effect being noticeable. As for Saudi Arabia and the UAE, the issue of enacting policies and legislations is fragile and not commensurate with the progress that the two countries have made in the field of caring for the gifted, with a relative advantage for the UAE, as the UAE has introduced some policies (David and Abukari, 2020). In Saudi Arabia, for example, the provisions on the general policies for the Gifted are still the same since 1969. Therefore, it is impractical to continue working on these policies since that date without renewal or changes commensurate with global development. Thus, it is concluded that one of the most prominent elements influencing the weak enactment of policies in both the UAE and Saudi Arabia is the educational systems bound by the inflexible public systems and their social and cultural orientations. However, the UAE has achieved relative progress in this area over Saudi Arabia because it has begun to adopt a few policies. Finally, the study was limited to examining the policies, legislation, and laws related to gifted care in Australia, South Korea, Saudi Arabia, and the United Arab Emirates. Future studies may extend the study period and include more countries as a sample for the investigation to be investigated. Finally, based on the previous review and findings, the study recommends various steps. For example, there is a need to start adopting local policies with international standards to achieve the best performance in the field of gifted care, in addition to adopting international standards in enacting policies and legislation while implementing social and cultural specificities as needed. Furthermore, it is essential to keep reviewing and updating the general policies of education, including those related to the care of the gifted, periodically and comprehensively. It is also advised that there should be a continual review of the central policies in the country and modernization and renewal following global developments. Policymakers should also pay attention to policies, including special groups and the complementary relationship between the family,

the local community, and the school. Furthermore, there should be continuously conducting further studies on policies and legislations for the care of the gifted in general and also studies in the field of policies and legislations for countries worldwide with more emphasis on the implementation of special studies on international standards for enacting policies and legislation and ways to apply them locally. Finally, there is a need to carry out a study that deals with the scientific evidence of the impact of enacting policies and legislation on the gifted field.

Acknowledgment

This work was supported by the Deanship of Scientific Research, Vice Presidency for Graduate Studies and Scientific Research, King Faisal University, Saudi Arabia [Grant No.3927].

Compliance with ethical standards

Conflict of interest

The author(s) declared no potential conflicts of interest with respect to the research, authorship, and/or publication of this article.

References

- ACERGS (2020). Nurturing the gifted: A survey study of the most prominent global trends and experiences and in the member states of the Bureau of Arab Education for the Gulf States. The Arab Center for Educational Research for the Gulf States, Dubai, UAE.
- Alfaiz FS, Alfaid AA, and Aljughaiman AM (2022). Current status of gifted education in Saudi Arabia. *Cogent Education*, 9(1): 2064585. <https://doi.org/10.1080/2331186X.2022.2064585>
- Aljughaiman AM and Grigorenko EL (2013). Growing up under pressure: The cultural and religious context of the Saudi system of gifted education. *Journal for the Education of the Gifted*, 36(3): 307-322. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0162353213493153>
- Al-Manqash SA (2006). An analytical study of education policies in the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia and proposals for their development. *King Saud University Journal of Islamic Studies and Educational Science*, 19(1): 381-440.
- Alshebami A, Al-Jubari I, Alyoussef I, and Raza M (2020). Entrepreneurial education as a predictor of community college of Abqaiq students' entrepreneurial intention. *Management Science Letters*, 10(15): 3605-3612. <https://doi.org/10.5267/j.msl.2020.6.033>
- Alshebami AS, Seraj AHA, and Alzain E (2022). Lecturers' creativity and students' entrepreneurial intention in Saudi Arabia. *Vision*. <https://doi.org/10.1177/09722629221099596>
- Avcu YE and Er KO (2017). Education of gifted and talented individuals in Germany, the Netherlands, Sweden and Turkey: An investigation of education policies and its implementations. *International Online Journal of Educational Sciences*, 9(4): 1154-1170. <https://doi.org/10.15345/ijoes.2017.04.018>
- Brady M (2015). An exploration of the impact of gifted and talented policies on inner city schools in England: A case study. Ph.D. Dissertation, Brunel University, London, UK.

- Brown E, Avery L, Van Tassel-Baska J, Worley BB, and Stambaugh T (2006). A five-state analysis of gifted education policies. *Roeper Review*, 29(1): 11-23. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02783190609554379>
- Brown EF and Garland RB (2015). Reflections on policy in gifted education: James J. Gallagher. *Journal for the Education of the Gifted*, 38(1): 90-96. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0162353214565558>
- Cao TH, Jung JY, 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. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1932202X17714572>
- Cho S and Suh Y (2016). Korean gifted education: Domain-specific developmental focus. *Talent*: 6(1): 3-13.
- David SA and Abukari A (2018). Education policy in the age of social advancement: Studies from the United Arab Emirates. Scholars Press, Chico, USA.
- David SA and Abukari A (2020). Perspectives of teachers' on the selection and the development of the school leaders in the United Arab Emirates. *International Journal of Educational Management*, 34(1): 56-69. <https://doi.org/10.1108/IJEM-02-2019-0057>
- ECSSR (2018). The reality of caring for the gifted in the United Arab Emirates, a field survey study 2012-2016. Emirates Center for Strategic Studies and Research, Qandil Printing and Publishing, Dubai, UAE.
- Gallagher JJ (2006). Future prospects for gifted education. In the Javits Grantee Meeting, Hartford, USA.
- Gallagher JJ (2015). Political issues in gifted education. *Journal for the Education of the Gifted*, 38(1): 77-89. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0162353214565546>
- Garrett L and Rubie-Davies C (2014). Talented tertiary students: A largely "forgotten" group within the tertiary sector? *International Journal of Teaching and Learning in Higher Education*, 26(1): 78-89.
- Gubbins EJ, Siegle D, Ottone-Cross K, McCoach DB, Langley SD, Callahan CM, Brodersen AV, and Caughey M (2021). Identifying and serving gifted and talented students: Are identification and services connected? *Gifted Child Quarterly*, 65(2): 115-131. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0016986220988308>
- Heuser BL, Wang K, and Shahid S (2017). Global dimensions of gifted and talented education: The influence of national perceptions on policies and practices. *Global Education Review*, 4(1): 4-21.
- Hong O (2017). STEAM education in Korea: Current policies and future directions. *Science and Technology Trends Policy Trajectories and Initiatives in STEM Education*, 8(2): 92-102.
- Hu H (2019). Implementing resilience recommendations for policies and practices in gifted curriculum. *Roeper Review*, 41(1): 42-50. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02783193.2018.1553216>
- Jolly JL and Robins JH (2021). Australian gifted and talented education: An analysis of government policies. *Australian Journal of Teacher Education (Online)*, 46(8): 70-95. <https://doi.org/10.14221/ajte.2021v46n8.5>
- Kang DY (2019). Past, present, and future of gifted science education in Korea: A historical perspective. *Asia-Pacific Science Education*, 5: 12. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s41029-019-0045-8>
- Kim YC, Jo J, and Jung JH (2020). The education of academically gifted students in South Korea: Innovative approaches in shadow education. *European Journal of Education*, 55(3): 376-387. <https://doi.org/10.1111/ejed.12399>
- Kipkoech LC, Kindiki JN, and Tarus PJ (2011). Effects of attitudes of academically talented students on performance: An ability or disability? *Problems of Education in the 21st Century*, 29: 63.
- Leu A, Guggiari E, Phelps D, Magnusson L, Nap HH, Hoefman R, Lewis F, Santini S, Socci M, Boccaletti L, and Hlebec V (2022). Cross-national analysis of legislation, policy and service frameworks for adolescent young carers in Europe. *Journal of Youth Studies*, 25(9): 1215-1235. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13676261.2021.1948514>
- Long LC, Barnett K, and Rogers KB (2015). Exploring the relationship between principal, policy, and gifted program scope and quality. *Journal for the Education of the Gifted*, 38(2): 118-140. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0162353215578279>
- Lupkowski-Shoplik A, Assouline SG, and Lange R (2022). Whole-grade acceleration: From student to policy. *Gifted Child Today*, 45(3): 143-149. <https://doi.org/10.1177/10762175221091856>
- Mandelman SD, Tan M, Aljughaiman AM, and Grigorenko EL (2010). Intellectual giftedness: Economic, political, cultural, and psychological considerations. *Learning and Individual Differences*, 20(4): 287-297. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.lindif.2010.04.014>
- McClain MC and Pfeiffer S (2012). Identification of gifted students in the United States today: A look at state definitions, policies, and practices. *Journal of Applied School Psychology*, 28(1): 59-88. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15377903.2012.643757>
- NAGC (2019). Pre-K to grade 12 gifted programming standards. National Association for Gifted Children, Washington D.C., USA.
- Ninkov I (2020). Education policies for gifted children within a human rights paradigm: A comparative analysis. *Journal of Human Rights and Social Work*, 5: 280-289. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s41134-020-00133-1>
- Özmen F and Kömürlü F (2013). Türkiye'de üstün zekâli ve yetenekli öğrencilerin eğitimine ilişkin politika ve uygulamalar. *İnönü Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 14(2): 35-56. <https://doi.org/10.17679/inuefd.108599>
- Pereira N, Knotts JD, and Roberts JL (2015). Current status of twice-exceptional students: A look at legislation and policy in the United States. *Gifted and Talented International*, 30(1-2): 122-134. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15332276.2015.1137463>
- Purcell JH and Eckert RD (2006). Designing services and programs for high-ability learners: A guidebook for gifted education. Corwin Press, Thousand Oaks, USA. <https://doi.org/10.4135/9781483329307>
- Rasmussen A and Lingard B (2018). Excellence in education policies: Catering to the needs of gifted and talented or those of self-interest? *European Educational Research Journal*, 17(6): 877-897. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1474904118771466>
- Robbins JI (2019). Gifted program evaluation: Catalyst for change or keeper of the culture. *Gifted Child Today*, 42(4): 196-204. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1076217519862326>
- Roberts JL, Pereira N, and Knotts JD (2015). State law and policy related to twice-exceptional learners: Implications for practitioners and policymakers. *Gifted Child Today*, 38(4): 215-219. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1076217515597276>
- Slater E (2018). The identification of gifted children in Australia: The importance of policy. *TalentEd*, 30: 1-16.
- Stephens KR (2011). Federal and state response to the gifted and talented. *Journal of Applied School Psychology*, 27(4): 306-318. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15377903.2011.615823>
- Stopper MJ (2013). Meeting the social and emotional needs of gifted and talented children. Routledge, Oxfordshire, UK. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315068725>
- Subotnik RF, Olszewski-Kubilius P, and Worrell FC (2011). Rethinking giftedness and gifted education: A proposed

direction forward based on psychological science.
Psychological Science in the Public Interest, 12(1): 3-54.

<https://doi.org/10.1177/1529100611418056>

PMid:26168418

Swanson JD and Lord EW (2013). Harnessing and guiding the power of policy: Examples from one state's experiences. Journal for the Education of the Gifted, 36(2): 198-219.

<https://doi.org/10.1177/0162353213480434>

Tomlinson S (2008). Gifted, talented and high ability: Selection for education in a one-dimensional world. Oxford Review of

Education, 34(1): 59-74.

<https://doi.org/10.1080/03054980701542096>

VanTassel-Baska J (2017). Curriculum issues: The importance of selecting literature for gifted learners. Gifted Child Today, 40(3): 183-184.

<https://doi.org/10.1177/1076217517713783>

Younis AC (2018). A critique of two giftedness policies in Dubai: Provision programs for gifted and talented students in highly-rated schools. West East Journal of Social Sciences, 7(3): 38-47.