

---

# Transition and Students With Twice Exceptionality\*

---

Susan Prior

*Southern Cross University, Lismore Campus, NSW, Australia*

*Twice exceptional* is one of the terms used to describe students who have giftedness and a disability. This is a small heterogeneous population of individual learners who are underserved in special, gifted, and mainstream education settings. Despite the availability of research on transition for students with disabilities, there is little research or literature available on transition for students who experience twice exceptionality (2E). This paper provides a review of the literature available on 2E, taking a lifespan perspective and a school transitions context for students experiencing 2E. Finally, the synthesis of 2E and transition highlights a potential way forward in the research across special, gifted, mainstream and inclusive education to transform student profiling, identification and transition.

**Keywords:** twice exceptional, gifted, disabilities, transition, special education

## *Transition as a Multilayered and Discontinuous Process*

There has been a shift in research over the last 20 years toward understanding transitions as multilayered processes that involve multiple discontinuities (Petrowskyj, Thorpe, & Tayler, 2005). Wider and more inclusive perspectives on transition allow us to be better informed on the variety of experiences over time for individual learners. Transitions can be understood as specific processes occurring during particular life course turning points. These processes are linked to changes in physical development, roles and relationships and require certain adjustments depending on the environment and the individual nature, culture and resilience of the person. This is the context for the following discussion on transition, students experiencing twice exceptionality (2E) and the expanding conceptualisations of giftedness and disability.

## *Legislative Developments and Giftedness as a Multifaceted Concept*

Two major legislative developments in the United States (US) in the 1970s were the Marland Report on Gifted Education (1972) and the (1975) Education for All Handicapped Children Act (cited in Assouline & Whiteman, 2011). However, this legislation still did not lead to a shared understanding about the students experiencing 2E, who were sometimes transferred between these separate fields of education. Giftedness and disability were seen as distinct, discrete diagnoses, so special education and gifted education remained mutually exclusive for nearly 30 years (Reis & McCoach, 2000).

---

**Correspondence:** Susan Prior, Southern Cross University Lismore Campus, c/o PO Box 45, Samford, Qld 4520, Australia. E-mail: s.prior.11@student.scu.edu.au

\*This manuscript was accepted under the Guest Editorship of Chris Forlin.

With the broadening conceptualisations of disability and giftedness since the 1970s (Ashman & Elkins, 2011) and greater moves toward inclusive education for all children, there is growing awareness that a student may have coexisting giftedness and disability to various degrees. By the 1980s in Australia, giftedness was being viewed as a multifaceted concept, but there were few Australian research studies on the ‘disabled gifted’ (Ashman & Elkins, 2005, p. 364). In an online database search for the *Australasian Journal of Gifted Education* in 2012, there were 15 articles relating to ‘gifted learning disabled’ (GLD) from 1995 to the present, and nine that included 2E from 1998. Most of these articles were produced during the Asia-Pacific conference on giftedness held in Sydney in 2010. In an online journal keyword search of the Australasian special education research journals from 1987 to 2012 no reference to students who experience 2E was discovered during this review. However, given the shared interest in students with disabilities such as autism spectrum disorder (ASD), there is potential for multidisciplinary collaborative research into 2E between gifted and special education in Australasia.

### *Introduction to Twice Exceptionality*

Although researchers and advocates in the field of gifted education do not necessarily agree on the terminology, awareness of this group of students has been acknowledged by respected researchers in gifted education for over 90 years. 2E wasn’t written into legislation in the US until 2004 (Assouline & Whiteman, 2011). As early as 1923, according to Coleman, Harradine, and Williams King (2005), Leta Stetter Hollingworth spoke of these students identified with ‘special talents and defects’; in 1971 June Maker referred to them as the ‘gifted handicapped’ and James Gallagher first coined the term ‘twice exceptional’ in 1975. Renzulli (1977) took the people-first language approach and suggested using ‘students who exhibit gifted behaviours’ as the general term for students who were gifted. Fetzer (2000) spoke of ‘dual exceptionalities’ for those who experienced 2E. It is also likely that 2E exists on a continuum across types and degrees given the many potentially different combinations of giftedness and disability (Cline & Hegeman, 2001). Terms such as GLD or 2E are now mostly interchangeable and common in the gifted education research, advocacy literature, and the learning disability field. GLD is to date the most researched combination of twice exceptionality in gifted education and includes disabilities such as ADHD, ASD and specific learning disabilities (SLD). Gallagher’s people-first term twice exceptional (2E) has been used in this article as it is broadly inclusive of disabilities and giftedness.

### *Inclusive Education and Twice Exceptionality*

Rarely is giftedness mentioned in the inclusive education literature (Smith, 2005); however, the UNESCO (1994) Salamanca Statement Framework for Action on Special Needs Education was clear that inclusion also meant giftedness: ‘This should include disabled and gifted children, . . .’ (p. 6). Inclusion goes beyond disability and aims to ensure all students achieve their individual educational potential (Rouse, 2012). How effectively barriers to learning are anticipated and removed for students who are experiencing 2E will depend on how broadly inclusive the school system is and how well prepared teachers are over time to support all students (Rouse, 2012). Understanding the possibility of 2E is important in research concerned with individual students’ learning needs. A view proposed by Assouline and Whiteman (2011) is that without a comprehensive understanding of the combination of giftedness and, for example, AS, an accurate diagnosis and appropriate educational provisions can be missed.

### *Myths and Misdiagnosis*

Within the last eight years, and since the reauthorisation of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA, 2004) in the USA (Coleman et al., 2005), it is now understood that giftedness and disability are not mutually exclusive. The Disability Standards for Education in Australia (Attorney-General's Department, 2005) does not mention 2E or GLD, so there may be an assumption in Australia that students who are also gifted do not require any special interventions. Teachers may believe that gifted means globally gifted or highly able across all domains at all times (Karnes, 2004). This belief denies the enormous diversity among gifted students and contributes to the lack of appropriate services for these students. Few mainstream teachers know how to recognise the characteristics of learners who are gifted, and fewer still recognise the paradoxical nature of students experiencing 2E (Bianco, 2005), so this situation needs to change through the education of teachers and policymakers. For example, some behaviours of gifted children can appear similar to behaviours that define other exceptionalities. Effective and efficient means of identification and provision are not yet well established for 2E, therefore students may remain unidentified, misdiagnosed and underserved (Webb et al., 2005). The most common misdiagnoses in gifted children and adults are ADHD, oppositional defiant disorder (ODD), obsessive-compulsive disorder (OCD), and mood disorders. A dual diagnosis of giftedness and disability or 2E is possible; however, identification and correct diagnosis require an understanding of personality factors, context and the degree of giftedness in the individual. Webb et al. (2005) suggest that discrepancy in a cognitive profile does not necessarily mean there is a learning disability. For this reason, psychologists need education in giftedness (Assouline & Whiteman, 2011).

### *Implications of Misdiagnosis*

Common in the literature on 2E is the well-accepted proposition that there are three types of learners who experience giftedness and disability. According to this idea, there are those who are gifted with subtle learning disabilities, which may only become apparent during transitions such as when schoolwork increases in difficulty. The second group is actually identified with a learning disability, but although gifted, may never be identified as gifted. The third group is not identified as gifted or with a disability because each *masks* the other and the student performs within average expectations (Wormald & Vialle, 2011). Disagreement exists over this concept of masking (McCoach, Kehle, Bray, & Siegle, 2001). However, misdiagnosis has major implications for the teacher's role in the identification process and delivery of appropriate transition support. The issue of misdiagnosis underscores the need for empirical research in this area.

### *Empirical Studies in Twice Exceptionality*

In an empirical investigation of 2E, Foley Nicpon and colleagues (2011) examined research from 1990 through 2010. They intentionally considered GLD, ADHD and ASD. Most studies were around the topic of identification and referral, but other categories were psychosocial factors and the effect of interventions. Several referred to transitions within the nature of their investigations, but it was not the central issue of any of the papers. There were a total of 43 empirical studies investigated. Twenty-one were about GLD, 17 focused on gifted/ADHD and five were about gifted students with ASD. Twenty-six empirical studies were published before 2005, but they were not referenced in the Ashman and Elkins (2005) text. In the *International Edition of the Education of the Gifted and Talented* (Davis, Rimm, & Siegle, 2011) there is no specific information on 2E and transitions.

Although in Australia gifted and special education tend to be separate entities, Asouline and Whiteman (2011) suggest that special education is an umbrella for exceptionality housing giftedness, 2E and disability. They recommend that, in recognising individual differences, educators and psychologists need to have a realistic understanding of the individual variations in physical, cognitive and social-emotional development in each group. Some of the core issues around transition and 2E will now be considered.

### *Profiling Students Experiencing Twice Exceptionality*

The language used to describe, define or identify need or ability is important in gaining access to appropriate services during transitions, such as before entry to school, during school, moving grades into middle or high school and leaving school. Students experiencing 2E may not be identified for any specialist service and therefore may be particularly at risk where they are not served for any of their special needs (Cline & Schwartz, 1999). This is because the identification processes in each of the fields of gifted and special education remain narrow in focus (Bianco & Leech, 2010). Bianco (2005) examined the effects of the disability labels 'learning disability' and 'emotional and behaviour disorders' on general and special education teacher referrals to gifted programs. Bianco concluded that these labels do influence educators' thinking and behaviour in that special educators do not tend to look for gifted behaviours or refer these students to gifted education services. Gates (2010) has renewed calls for the field of gifted education to change, take note of developments in special education and focus on the whole child rather than the labels. Research by Hands (2011) found that in different educational settings, beliefs and teacher training lead to varying success in profiling students experiencing 2E. Mainstream teachers are more likely than special education teachers to refer students with disabilities to gifted education services.

According to Rogers (2011), 14% of the gifted population in her study showed some form of disability. This is compared with previous estimates that 2–5% of the gifted population will have disabilities and 2–5% of students with disabilities will be gifted (Nielsen, 2002). Lovett and Sparks (2011) agree the 2E population exists, but challenge the prevalence based on GLD identification in particular. Due to such wide variability in criteria, definitions and assessments, identification and profiling processes need to be prioritised in the research.

### *Teachers' Role in the Identification Process*

All teachers need to know about students who experience 2E (Karnes, 2004, p. 18). Clark (2002) stated that professional development for special education teachers is essential as students with disabilities in vision, communication, hearing, behaviour, social-emotional development or learning may also be gifted. Vialle and Rogers (2012) argue that the challenge for inclusion of students who are gifted is the adequate education of all teachers in the nature and needs of students experiencing giftedness.

### *Identification During School Transition Processes*

Transitions are spaces where deeper learning and self-awareness can occur and where different individual needs and roles can be negotiated so that students can develop their talent and themselves (Moon & Reis, 2004). Unfortunately, most students with 2E are not identified for either their disabilities or their exceptional abilities until much later in life (Brody & Mills, 1997). According to one study, 41% of the gifted students with disabilities were not diagnosed until college (McEachern & Bornot, 2001). In order to

identify and profile students with special needs of any kind, teachers need to know what to look for, and have valid screening instruments and flexible assessment processes sensitive enough to assist in identification. As many students who experience 2E remain undetected, the identification process can be delayed, if it happens at all. According to Dole (2001), there is little research available about the role of delayed 2E identification on the identity formation of learners who experience 2E. However, vulnerability, poor self-concept, poor self-efficacy, hypersensitivity and high levels of frustration, anxiety and self-criticism are reported, thus improving the outcomes for the students is vital. According to one student with 2E, 'school is a place where you grow and learn, it's not just some place where you "are"' (Coleman, 2001, p. 62).

School transitions, such as entering third grade, middle school, high school and college, present opportunities for a learner to be identified as experiencing 2E because work and curriculum demands increase, along with the amplified need for organisational skills and the expectations of greater independence. Students who experience 2E could be described as being in transition between different educational cultures, making exceptional efforts to prove they are 'normal' (Cline & Hegeman, 2001) as they experience vulnerability due to individual developmental asynchrony (Silverman, 2007). They may not fit neatly into the usual age-grade lock step of school, but require flexible acceleration for their giftedness and remediation or accommodation for their difficulties. These students may follow a different developmental trajectory from learners who are not experiencing this asynchrony (Baum, Dann, Novak, & Preuss, 2009). Clues to difficulties arising may be that assignments are not handed in, are inadequate or late, or behaviour becomes difficult where the student appears lazy or disruptive. However, clues can be easy to misinterpret (Hands, 2011), so students need to be monitored closely and involved as agents in examining their own learning (Prior, 2011). Students experiencing 2E can become more successful in school (Moon & Reis, 2004) if the assessment of their abilities and needs occurs earlier, and is more comprehensive and individualised (Foley Nicpon et al., 2011). A coherent instructional framework is needed with the best fit between these students' asynchronous needs and flexible, effective provision over time and transitions (Hughes & Rollins, 2009).

### *Early Childhood and Transition to School*

Optimal child development requires early identification, profiling and assessment of needs because attitudes toward learning and self begin early in a child's life (Chamberlain, Buchanan, & Vercimak, 2007). There is a lack of research documenting children's experiences in the transition to early childhood education. It is acknowledged that the transition will be more difficult depending on the degree of discontinuity between early childhood and beginning school (Davies, 2011). One of the possible transition issues for students who are highly gifted is early entry into school. Highly gifted children generally are considered at risk in the early years of school through the inappropriate match of needs to the curriculum provided. When disability is added to the mix, the transition to school can be fraught with many difficulties because a high level of giftedness alone can create significant discrepancies from typical age peer milestones (Gross, 2004). A rare example of a research paper on learners experiencing 2E entering preschool is from Chamberlain et al. (2007). The authors suggested that routines-based assessment and play-based assessment might be particularly effective in identifying and providing for the needs of preschool children experiencing 2E. They acknowledged that little had been done in either gifted or early childhood special education to address the needs of this 2E group.

## Adolescence

Generally, adolescence is a stressful period for all students (Pearce & Forlin, 2005). Individuals are faced with many changes, both within themselves and in relation to others. In the case of the student experiencing 2E, their giftedness may create more intense or extreme pressures than would be usual (Coleman & Cross, 2005). They are also likely to be even more vulnerable to stress due to their combination of factors (Coleman, 2001). For example, the upper primary and early middle years of schooling may involve movement from mainstream education into special education for some students identified with difficulties (Mastropieri & Scruggs, 2010). The timing of appropriate accommodations, such as acceleration, is critical for students experiencing 2E so there is opportunity to demonstrate their ability and compensate for their difficulties (Colangelo, Assouline, & Gross, 2004). A process referred to as *dual differentiation* was suggested in the gifted education literature calling for a concentration on the giftedness while also providing opportunities for these students to learn compensatory strategies for their difficulties (Baum, Cooper, & Neu, 2001). There are few successful programs designed to transition students experiencing 2E from primary through to high school. Two of these programs are the 'GOLD' program (Bees, 1998) and 'The Wings Mentoring Program' (Shevitz, Weinfield, Jeweler, & Barnes-Robinson, 2003).

## Social-Emotional Needs in Transition

Psychosocial strength or grit is at the centre of eminent levels of achievement and needs to be developed in order to support students through key transitions in their talent development (Duckworth, Kirby, Tsukayama, Berstein, & Ericsson, 2011). This helps lead to self-efficacy, self-determination and self-actualisation, which are goals for all students. Highlighting the importance of transition periods at specific life intervals indicates the need to prepare for transitions through choice making for the future (Subotnik, Olszewski-Kubilius, & Worrell, 2011). Protective factors are important in terms of resilience for all learners. Dweck (2006) created the term 'mindset' to describe the attitudes learners have toward intelligence and whether they have a fixed mindset, or a growth mindset (intelligence is malleable and responds to development processes). A growth mindset allows for personal responsibility in learning, failure, change and progress. Students who experience 2E particularly need the protective factor of a growth mindset. Betts and Niehart (2010) developed a theoretical model to profile gifted students differentiated by their behaviour, feelings and needs. Six profiles are described, one of which is 2E. In terms of school support for this 2E student profile, challenge in the area of strength is the first priority. Van Tassel-Baska, Feng, Swanson, Quek, and Chandler (2009) recommend counselling for the transition to high school as part of a range of support services over primary school years for students who experience 2E.

## Synthesis of Relationships

Clark (2002) pointed out that to serve gifted students with disabilities a collaborative effort and a case manager are required. Special education has been using this case management approach successfully for some time with students who have disabilities. Pearce and Forlin (2005) recommended collaboration between special and general educators and other specialists for an inclusive schooling approach for students with disabilities. This could be broadened in the Australasian special education research to form collaborative partnerships with gifted education specialists for students with disabilities who are also gifted. Crim, Hawkins, Ruban, and Johnson (2008) suggested that 2E be included in

the larger discussion of special education generally. Cross-discipline approaches would be useful to build on relevant research from other domains, and more complex methodologies with larger sample sizes would assist researchers to begin to better understand the ways in which high ability and disability affect each other. Methods of early identification using collaborative, multidisciplinary approaches and methodology that assist educational programmers in profiling strengths, and under which circumstances these occur, are required. Undertaking longitudinal studies to understand the outcomes for children with various forms of 2E across their lifespan is seen as valuable. Interventions are a research priority (Foley Nicpon et al., 2011).

## Conclusion

The available literature on transitions and students experiencing 2E is rare. In increasingly inclusive communities, greater collaborative research is needed across gifted, inclusive, mainstream and special education research in order to address this gap in knowledge. Timely identification and profiling processes, including flexible differentiated support systems, for students experiencing 2E need further investigation. Issues associated with asynchronous development suggest that research needs to establish a framework of what it means to experience 2E and what works for individual students. Further collaborative, multidisciplinary research is required to understand the role school and other transitions play in the identification of learners experiencing 2E and, most importantly, providing opportunities for their transformation and growth.

## References

- Ashman, A., & Elkins, J. (2005). *Educating children with diverse abilities* (2nd ed.). Frenchs Forest, Australia: Pearson Education
- Ashman, A., & Elkins, J. (2011). *Education for inclusion and diversity* (4th ed.). Frenchs Forest, Australia: Pearson Education
- Assouline, S.G., & Whiteman, C.S. (2011). Twice-exceptionality: Implications for school psychologists in the post-IDEA 2004 era. *Journal of Applied School Psychology, 27*, 380–402. doi:10.1080/15377903.2011.616576
- Attorney-General's Department. (2005). *Disability Standards for Education 2005 plus guidance notes*. Canberra: Commonwealth of Australia. Retrieved October 18, 2012, from [http://www.deewr.gov.au/Schooling/Programs/Documents/Disability\\_Standards\\_for\\_Education\\_2005.pdf](http://www.deewr.gov.au/Schooling/Programs/Documents/Disability_Standards_for_Education_2005.pdf)
- Baum, S.M., Cooper, C.R., & Neu, T.W. (2001). Dual differentiation: An approach for meeting the curricular needs of gifted students with learning disabilities. *Psychology in the Schools, 38*, 477–490. doi:10.1002/pits.1036
- Baum, S., Dann, M., Novak, C., & Preuss, L. (2009). The mythology of learning, Part 2. In their own stream: Managing dynamic asynchrony. 2E *Twice Exceptional Newsletter, March 2009*(33). Retrieved from [http://www.2enewsletter.com/topic\\_articles\\_myths\\_2.html](http://www.2enewsletter.com/topic_articles_myths_2.html)
- Bees, C. (1998). The GOLD Program: A program for gifted learning disabled adolescents. *Roeper Review, 21*, 155–161. doi:10.1080/02783199809553951
- Betts, G.T., & Niehart, M. (2010). *Revised profiles of the gifted and talented*. Retrieved October 19, 2012, from <http://www.ingenious.net/archives/dr-george-betts-and-dr-maureen-neihart-share-revised-profiles-of-gifted>
- Bianco, M. (2005). The effects of disability labels on special education and general education teachers' referrals for gifted programs. *Learning Disability Quarterly, 28*, 285–293. doi:10.2307/4126967
- Bianco, M., & Leech, N.L. (2010). Twice-exceptional learners: Effects of teacher preparation and disability labels on gifted referrals. *Teacher Education and Special Education, 33*, 319–334. doi:10.1177/0888406409356392

- Brody, L.E., & Mills, C.J. (1997). Gifted children with learning disabilities: A review of the issues. *Journal of Learning Disabilities, 30*, 282–296. doi:10.1177/002221949703000304
- Chamberlain, S.A., Buchanan, M., & Vercimak, D. (2007). Serving twice-exceptional preschoolers: Blending gifted education and early childhood special education practices in assessment and program planning. *Journal for the Education of the Gifted, 30*, 372–394.
- Clark, B. (2002). *Growing up gifted: Developing the potential of children at home and at school* (6th ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Merrill/Prentice-Hall.
- Cline, S., & Schwartz, D. (1999). *Diverse populations of gifted children: Meeting their needs in the regular classroom and beyond*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Merrill/Prentice Hall.
- Cline, S., & Hegeman, K. (2001). Gifted children with disabilities. *Gifted Child Today, 24*(3), 16–24.
- Colangelo, N., Assouline, S.G., & Gross, M.U.M. (Eds.). (2004). *A nation deceived: How schools hold back America's brightest students*. The Templeton National Report on Acceleration. Iowa City: Belin Blank International Centre for Gifted Education and Talent Development.
- Coleman, M.R. (2001). Surviving or thriving? 21 gifted boys with learning disabilities share their school stories. *Gifted Child Today, 24*(3), 56.
- Coleman, L.J., & Cross, T.L. (2005). *Being gifted in school: An introduction to development, guidance, and teaching* (2nd ed.). Waco, TX: Prufrock Press.
- Coleman, M.R., Harradine, C., & Williams King, E. (2005). Meeting the needs of students who are twice exceptional [Editorial]. *Teaching Exceptional Children, 38*(1), 5–6.
- Crim, C., Hawkins, J., Ruban, L., & Johnson, S. (2008). Curricular modifications for elementary students with learning disabilities in high-, average-, and low-IQ groups. *Journal of Research in Childhood Education, 22*, 233–245. doi:10.1080/02568540809594624
- Davies, D. (2011). *Child development: A practitioner's guide* (3rd ed.). New York, NY: Guilford Press.
- Davis, G.A., Rimm, S.B., & Siegle, D. (2011). *Education of the gifted and talented* (6th ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson International.
- Dole, S. (2001). Reconciling contradictions: Identity formation in individuals with giftedness and learning disabilities. *Journal for the Education of the Gifted, 25*, 103–137.
- Duckworth, A.L., Kirby, T.A., Tsukayama, E., Berstein, H., & Ericsson, K.A. (2011). Deliberate practice spells success: Why grittier competitors triumph at the National Spelling Bee. *Social Psychology & Personality Science, 2*, 174–181. doi:10.1177/1948550610385872
- Dweck, C.S. (2006). *Mindset: The new psychology of success*. New York, NY: Random House.
- Fetzer, E.A. (2000). The gifted/learning disabled child. *Gifted Child Today, 23*(4), 44–51.
- Foley Nicpon, M., Allmon, A., Sieck, B., & Stinson, R.D. (2011). Empirical investigation of twice-exceptionality: Where have we been and where are we going? *Gifted Child Quarterly, 55*, 3–17. doi:10.1177/0016986210382575
- Gates, J. (2010). Children with gifts and talents: Looking beyond traditional labels. *Roeper Review, 32*, 200–206. doi:10.1080/02783193.2010.485308
- Gross, M.U.M. (2004). *Exceptionally gifted children* (2nd ed.). London, UK: Routledge Falmer.
- Hands, R.E. (2011). *The phenomenon of underachievement: Listening to the voice of a twice exceptional adolescent* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest, UMI Dissertation Publishing, USA.
- Hollingworth, L. (1923). *Special talents and defects: Their significance for education*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Library.
- Hughes, C.E., & Rollins, K. (2009). RtI for nurturing giftedness: Implications for the RtI school based team. *Gifted Child Today, 32*(3), 31–39.
- Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA), 20 U.S.C. § 1400 *et seq.* (2004).
- Karnes, F. (2004). Gifted students with disabilities: Are we finding them? *Gifted Child Today, 27*(4), 16–21.
- Lovett, B., & Sparks, R.L. (2011). The identification and performance of gifted students with learning disability diagnoses: A quantitative synthesis. *Journal of Learning Disabilities*. Advance online publication. doi:10.1177/0022219411421810
- Mastropieri, M.A., & Scruggs, T.E. (2010). *The inclusive classroom: Strategies for effective differentiated instruction* (4th ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Merrill.



- McCoach, D.B., Kehle, T.J., Bray, M.A., & Siegle, D. (2001). Best practices in the identification of gifted students with learning disabilities. *Psychology in the Schools, 38*, 403–411. doi:10.1002/pits.1029
- McEachern, A.G., & Bornot, J. (2001). Gifted students with learning disabilities: Implications and strategies for school counselors. *Professional School Counseling, 5*, 34–41.
- Moon, S.M., & Reis, S.M. (2004). Acceleration and twice exceptional students. In N. Colangelo, S.G. Assouline, & M.U.M. Gross (Eds.), *A nation deceived: How schools hold back America's brightest students* (Vol. 2, pp. 109–119). Iowa City, IA: The Connie Belin & Jacqueline N Blank Center for Gifted Education and Talent Development.
- Nielsen, M.E. (2002). Gifted students with learning disabilities: Recommendations for identification and programming. *Exceptionality, 10*, 93–111. doi:10.1207/S15327035EX1002\_4
- Pearce, M., & Forlin, C. (2005). Challenges and potential solutions for enabling inclusion in secondary schools. *Australasian Journal of Special Education, 29*, 93–105. doi:10.1080/1030011050290202
- Petriwskyj, A., Thorpe, K., & Tayler, C. (2005). Trends in construction of transition to school in three western regions, 1990–2004. *International Journal of Early Years Education, 13*, 55–69. doi:10.1080/09669760500048360
- Prior, S. (2011). Student voice: What do students who are intellectually gifted say they experience and need in the inclusive classroom? *Gifted and Talented International, 26*(1–2), 121–129.
- Reis, S.M., & McCoach, D.B. (2000). The underachievement of gifted students: What do we know and where do we go? *Gifted Child Quarterly, 44*, 152–170. doi:10.1177/001698620004400302
- Renzulli, J.S. (1977). *The enrichment triad model: A guide for developing defensible programs for the gifted and talented*. Mansfield center, CT: Creative Learning Press.
- Rogers, K.B. (2011). Thinking smart about twice exceptional learners: Steps for finding them and strategies for catering to them appropriately. In C. Wormald & W. Vialle (Eds.), *Dual exceptionality* (pp. 57–70). University of Wollongong, Australia: AAEGT.
- Rouse, M. (2012). Foreword. In C. Forlin (Ed.), *Future directions for inclusive teacher education: An international perspective*. Oxon, UK: Routledge.
- Silverman, L.K. (2007). *What we have learned about gifted children: 1979–2007*. Denver, CO: Gifted Development Center.
- Smith, C. (2005, August). *Paradigm shifts in inclusive and gifted education*. Paper presented at the Inclusive and Supportive Education Congress, Glasgow, Scotland. Retrieved December 26, 2012, from [http://www.isec2005.org.uk/isec/abstracts/papers\\_s/smith\\_c.shtml](http://www.isec2005.org.uk/isec/abstracts/papers_s/smith_c.shtml)
- Subotnik, R.F., Olszewski-Kubilius, P., & Worrell, F.C. (2011). Rethinking giftedness and gifted education: A proposed direction forward based on psychological science. *Psychological Science in the Public Interest, 12*, 3–54. doi:10.1177/1529100611418056
- Shevitz, B., Weinfield, R., Jeweler, S., & Barnes-Robinson, L. (2003). Mentoring empowers gifted/learning disabled students to soar! *Roeper Review, 26*, 37–40. doi:10.1080/02783190309554237
- UNESCO. (1994). *The Salamanca statement and framework for action on special needs education*. Paris, France: Author.
- Van Tassel-Baska, J., Feng, A.X., Swanson, J.D., Quek, C., & Chandler, K. (2009). Academic and affective profiles of low-income, minority, and twice-exceptional gifted learners: The role of gifted program membership in enhancing self. *Journal of Advanced Academics, 20*, 702–739. doi:10.1177/1932202X0902000406
- Vialle, W., & Rogers, K.B. (2012). Gifted, talented or educationally disadvantaged? The case for including 'giftedness' in teacher education programs. In C. Forlin (Ed.), *Future directions for inclusive teacher education: An international perspective* (pp. 114–122). Oxon, UK: Routledge.
- Webb, J.T., Amend, E.R., Webb, N.E., Goerss, J., Beljan, P., & Olenchak, F.R. (2005). *Misdiagnosis and dual diagnosis of gifted children and adults: ADHD, bipolar, OCD, Asperger's, depression and other disorders*. Scottsdale, AZ: Great Potential Press.
- Wormald, C., & Vialle, W. (2011). *Dual exceptionality*. University of Wollongong, Australia: AAEGT.