

# PECULIARITIES OF EDUCATION OF GIFTED STUDENTS IN GYMNASIUM: VIEWS OF LITHUANIAN AND UKRAINIAN TEACHERS

**Rasa Braslauskienė**

Klaipėda University, Lithuania

**Reda Jacynė**

Klaipėda University, Lithuania

**Laima Kuprienė**

Klaipėda University, Lithuania

**Marina Ponomarenko**

Klaipėda University, Lithuania

**Abstract.** *Identifying gifted children and teenagers and their educational needs is one of the most relevant psychological and pedagogical problems, which is currently of great interest worldwide. Recognizing person's talents in education does not create added value by itself, the design of the educational process and the progress of the person's maturity related to diagnostics is much more valuable. The article analyzes how to educate gifted children, how different trends in the education of gifted children are developed, and what means are used to achieve affordable, high quality, modern education that meets the needs of a free civil society. The aim of the qualitative research was to reveal the views of Lithuanian and Ukrainian teachers about the peculiarities of the education of gifted students in gymnasiums. The data obtained during the research in identifying gifted students, the peculiarities of the education of these students and the effectiveness of educational tools revealed the educational difficulties faced by teachers and the opportunities for improving the education of gifted students in gymnasium. A qualitative study of teachers' views revealed that the identification of gifted students in the gymnasiums of both countries takes place when teachers pay attention to such student traits as creativity, critical thinking, etc.; teachers of both countries apply additional and individualized teaching methods when working with gifted students. The findings of the study revealed teachers' views about the effectiveness of educational methods of gifted students, the difficulties of educating gifted students, and provided practice-based suggestions for pedagogues who educate gifted students.*

**Keywords:** *gifted education, gifted students, gymnasium, Lithuania, teachers, Ukraine.*

## Introduction

Now more than ever, education of gifted students is receiving worldwide attention, because it contributes to the development of human capital as well as promotes and facilitates economic development in many societies. Inclusive

education is the guiding principle of the European Schools, which serve a diverse and mobile pupil population and offers diverse/flexible teaching and learning approaches adapted to children with different learning profiles (Tallinn European School, 2021). The following document discusses different forms and levels of support that is provided in European schools and is intended for the proper provision of equal opportunities to all students, including those with special educational needs or learning difficulties, and gifted students, so that they can develop to their full potential.

Education of gifted students encompasses all kinds of programmes, relies upon various educational strategies that are based on the results of international competitions and rankings, and addresses solutions to the social challenges of the future. Whatever the objective for educating gifted students, it remains a complex and open-ended issue that must be broken down into manageable parts (Neber, 2020). Moreover, the current state of teacher education for the gifted in many European countries was reviewed and it was unexpectedly found that teacher training on gifted education has been largely neglected, although great attention is paid to the education of the gifted (Cheung et al., 2022).

The aim of the article is to reveal the opinion of gymnasium teachers about the peculiarities of the education of gifted students in Lithuania and Ukraine. Research design was constructed on the basis of problematic questions: what are the criteria for identifying gifted students? What are the methods of educating gifted students? What are the difficulties in education of gifted students? The following research methods were used: analysis of scientific literature and documents, qualitative research (standardized interview), content analysis of research findings.

### **Theoretical Insights**

Conceptualization of the concept of gifted children is interpreted very differently not only in the countries of the Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development, but also in individual member countries. To date, there is no international consensus on the definition of gifted (Rutigliano & Quarshie, 2021). The identification of a gifted student is difficult not only because of the variety of talents, but also because of the expensive methodology available only to professionals. Cognition and evaluation are related to complex research that requires a lot of investment and the conclusions of which are not stable and long-term (Survutaitė, 2022), cognition and evaluation are associated with various and different manifestations of talents, the field of research is constantly expanding (Belska, 2022; Voloshhuk & Gal'chenko, 2022; Dinichenko, 2000). When using the concept of a gifted child, the emphasis is not on the level of existing knowledge, but on a higher potential to acquire knowledge, understand and use it. The following term makes it possible to compare children's potential

to learn and master one or more activities and become proficient in them. The number of peers that a child has to surpass in order to be classified as gifted depends on the attitude. Comparative study among the 30 member countries of the Eurydice Network shows that according to the assessments and criteria applied in different European countries, gifted children make up 3–10% (Survutaitė, 2022). Nevertheless, each child should have access to quality education regardless of his or her origin and residence, in order to maximize their potential and thus improve the quality of the society in which they live. The following approach is based on the provision that every child should be expected to reach maximum achievements regardless of their abilities, emphasizing thereby the greater importance of the school's professional autonomy and leadership (Papak et al., 2018).

The concepts of giftedness define the variety of theoretical models of the education of gifted. Currently, there are several conceptions of giftedness that gained international recognition: J. Renzulli's Three Ring Conception, A. Tannenbaum's Psychosocial Classification, and F. Gagne's Differentiated Model of Giftedness and Talent (Survutaitė, 2022). The latter conception consists of a person's natural areas of ability and internal as well as external catalysts that cause the transformation of abilities into talents. Giftedness is usually perceived as a relatively fixed and innate characteristic of a student, an essential ability or potential to learn. Therefore, the following potential must first be identified and then adapted to appropriate levels of achievement through appropriate educational programs (Neber, 2020). Often teachers' beliefs involve subjective theories of teaching and learning as well as subjective theories about students' characteristics, which play an important role for the interaction with students in the school context. Research carried out by S. Matheis et al. (2017) revealed that both in-service and pre-service teachers can hold incorrect beliefs about gifted students combining positive attributes of high intellectual ability with social, emotional, or behavioural difficulties. These beliefs can negatively affect the identification of gifted students and determine the peculiarities of education.

Educational practice analysed by K. Valiušytė and V. Lamanaukas (2021) showed that general education schools usually apply differentiation according to students' abilities, inclinations, and interests. The second strategy used by teachers is the enrichment of the educational content, which allows the teacher to easily involve all students, including the gifted ones. It also allows to respond directly to the needs of students at the highest level and accordingly maintain their activity. The third strategy, acceleration of education, is one of the most effective means of impact, but requires additional school resources and, therefore, is rarely used. A qualitative study of the opinions of 10 teachers of general education schools conducted in 2021 (Valiušytė & Lamanaukas, 2021) shows that "there are certain differences between the analysed schools. Some schools systematically and qualitatively educate the gifted, while others have no common agreements on

the education of the gifted, there is a lack of system, support for teachers and students”.

Over the past ten years, there was an increase in the attention to the study of various aspects of children's giftedness in the system of education and science of Ukraine. During the following period, the international experience of working with gifted children was analysed, and various opinions of teachers towards peculiarities of interaction with gifted children of different ages were formulated (Holod, 2014; Janlin', 2018); innovative approaches to solving issues of support and assistance of gifted students in the modern informational and educational spaces were proposed (Androsovich, 2018).

H. Neber (2020) claims that students' talents can be perceived as a variable characteristic, a potential that can be improved through teaching, and not only transformed into academic achievements or results. In this approach, teaching should aim to raise the level of abilities of all students. When giftedness is recognized, it only indicates the current level, but not absolute or permanent. E. Reid and H. Boettger (2015) distinguish the most important aspects of the qualitative education of gifted students: highly qualified teachers who work to the highest standards; managers who provide necessary support to teachers; high level of school community; qualitative education programs; assessment of individuality; honest, responsible, flexible education of each child; purposeful investment of funds to achieve the best results. Equally important in working with gifted students are: teachers' self-efficacy; teachers' enthusiasm; teachers' beliefs about gifted students (Matheis, et al., 2017). Working with gifted students requires teachers to have a set of necessary skills, desire to improve skills, knowledge of creative thinking and to be always ready for self-development (Khalikova & Khalikov, 2020). Many gifted children need comprehensive development of their talents, and the teacher needs to identify the natural talent of the child as soon as possible in order to further develop his abilities in the future. The following requires professional and personal preparation of teachers to work on identifying, educating and guiding gifted children towards further development.

A. Ch. Cheung et al. (2022) research reveals that gifted and talented students often do not receive adequate attention in the education system because most teachers believe that these learners can do well on their own, without special or additional support. Such students, however, should be challenged and supported in order to reach their highest potential. Accordingly, teachers must have professional knowledge that would allow to adopt specialized instructional practices such as differentiation and flexible grouping. In order to fully promote the development of gifted students, teachers must embrace changes in knowledge, attitudes, and teaching practices as well as fully engage in their own professional development. The study of educational practice (Cheung et al., 2022) shows that teachers still hold myths about gifted students. The following stops teachers from using effective teaching strategies, such as accelerating high-ability learners, and

subsequently prevents them from developing their potential. E. Reid and H. Boettger's (2015) studies of the system of educating gifted students in Europe showed that most programmes for gifted are aimed at ambiguous and high-achieving individuals, leaving underachievers behind. The vast majority of the gifted are hidden from the view. The responsibility for recognising the gifted lies with schools, teachers and parents. Teachers do not get enough knowledge about gifted children during teacher training; accordingly, they are not always able to recognize the talents of their students. Therefore, it should be done not only by teachers, but also by other professionals (e.g., psychologists). E. Reid and H. Boettger (2015) believe that, above all, gifted children should be recognized. They need professionals who understand the problems of talent, their aspirations, their search for meaning, their desire for connection, and their complexity, sensitivity and intensity. Without deliberate search for the gifted and sensitive school programmes for all the gifted (including underachievers), there will not be successful and fair education for all gifted individuals.

H. Neber (2020) studied initiatives aimed at transforming the awareness for gifted education into concrete solutions and points out that such initiatives usually are bottom-up. Highly motivated and engaged teachers want to establish gifted programmes in their classrooms. Such activities have a positive effect on the professional development of teacher and are an effective means to gain experience in the application of innovative educational methods. Research has also shown that if such innovations are strictly prescribed from the top down (e.g., by the school district or principal), the results are often negative and ineffective. H. Neber (2020) believes that integrating education of gifted students into traditional schools would help improve the quality of not only specific schools, but also the whole educational system. In order to achieve this ambitious goal, it is especially important to focus on programmes that develop giftedness at the classroom level. Classroom-level integration is more authentic than offering an add-on, extracurricular program, which often neglects the details for developing the required teaching strategies. Research by S. Matheis et al. (2017) showed the need for educational provision on giftedness and gifted education within teacher education courses, because teacher's knowledge, attitude, and motivation are very significant for actual classroom behaviour, students' motivation, and their desire to know and do more, and spread their talents.

### **Methodology**

The authors of the following research comply with the methodological approach of the paradigm of differentiation, which addresses the diverse needs of the child, goes beyond the compulsory school curriculum, and seeks progress (Dai, Chen, 2013). The qualitative research was chosen to reveal the attitudes of teachers towards the peculiarities of education of gifted students in Lithuanian

and Ukrainian gymnasiums. The research used a structured interview: during the research, informants were asked pre-defined questions, the questions were asked in the same order with the same wording of the questions. The themes of the interview questions were formulated on the basis of problematic questions: What are the criteria for identifying gifted students? What are the methods of educating gifted students? What are effective means of educating gifted students? What are the difficulties in education of gifted students? The data obtained during the research were analysed using the method of qualitative content analysis. The qualitative content analysis was carried out in accordance with the inductive logic of categorization that is based on research data. When performing the qualitative content analysis, the following consistency was ensured (Creswell, 2014): multiple reading and rethinking of the transcribed interview texts, data coding by distinguishing meaningful units in the text, grouping codes into subcategories, forming categories from subcategories, integrating categories/subcategories into the context of the analysed phenomenon, interpreting research data. Research data were analysed by four researchers. According to Žydzūnaitė and Sabaliauskas (2017), “it is difficult to ensure the relevance and reliability of the results when analysis is carried out by one researcher” (p. 324). Before starting to analyse data, the researchers agreed on the data analysis. The researchers performed primary data analysis individually by coding data and forming primary subcategories and categories. Afterwards, the researchers compared the primary subcategories and categories, discussed and finally formed them by mutual agreement.

The research used a targeted criterion selection of research participants. Research participants were selected according to the main criterion: teachers, who work with high school students aged 16 to 18 years. A total of 23 participants took part in the research: 15 teachers from four gymnasiums in the city of Klaipėda (Lithuania; hereinafter: LT) and 8 teachers from general education schools in 6 cities (Kramatorsk, Odessa, Poltava, Sarata, Barvenkovo, Kharkiv) of three regions of Ukraine (hereinafter: UA). Research with the Klaipėda city gymnasium teachers was conducted in April–May 2022, with Ukrainian teachers in September–October 2022. Demographic characteristics of research participants: all research participants were female. The average age of informants from Klaipėda was 49 years, from Ukraine – 51 years. The average teaching experience of teachers from Klaipėda was 28 years, from Ukraine – 30 years.

Data collection and analysis. When planning research, a written interview was chosen, which, according to I. Gaižauskaitė and N. Valavičienė (2016), is an exceptional form of interview with absolutely no verbal or visual communication – “conversation” takes place through correspondence. In the case of the following research, it was an e-mail interview. The advantages of such interview: an interview transcript is immediately formed; research participant’s information is recorded exactly as one has provided it. Moreover, such an interview made it possible to reach geographically distant research participants and was practical,

since research participant and the researcher did not have to coordinate with each other in terms of time and place. Interview questions were sent to the research participants by e-mail. Having answered the questions, the informants sent their answers to the researchers. One correspondence session was enough for the following research, all informants answered the questions correctly and sufficiently on the first try, thus no clarifications or additional correspondence were necessary. Research participants were coded (Klaipėda city teachers: from M1 to M15; Ukrainian teachers: from U1 to U8). The research is based on the principles of respect for the person's free decision to participate in the research, information about the research, beneficence and non-maleficence towards the researched person, confidentiality and anonymity (Wiles, 2012). Research participants took part in the research voluntarily and agreed for the written interview form to be used, thus ensuring anonymity and confidentiality of their responses. In the article, the answers of research participants are presented in tables.

### Research Findings

Research findings are grouped into three categories: Criteria for identifying gifted students; Ways of educating gifted students; Difficulties in education of gifted students.

In the first category, *Criteria for identifying gifted students*, 5 subcategories have been identified: *Pursuit of knowledge*; *Ability to learn*; *Creativity*; *Critical thinking*; *Individuality*. The subcategory of the *Pursuit of knowledge* was distinguished by 6 LT informants (“curiosity” (M3); “interest in the subject” (M4); “is curious” (M5); “desire to learn something more” (M9); “desire to get to know oneself and others” (M12); “I pay attention to curiosity, inquisitiveness” (M15)) and 4 UA informants (“need for interrupted knowledge of new information” (U1); “they are distinguished by their interest in different areas” (U3); “achieving exceptional success in a specific activity” (U4); “express interest” (U5)). The subcategory of *Ability to learn* was singled out by 5 LT informants (“ability to quickly learn new material, complete tasks accurately and in full” (M1); “speed of completing tasks” (M3); “learn from experience” (M5); “hardworking” (M7); “independent preparation for the lesson, striving not to leave gaps” (M13); “interested in the surrounding world, likes to learn by heart” (M15)) and 7 UA informants (“search for new information” (U1); “understanding of the subject and consistency in the perception of information” (U2); “the process of learning is more rapid” (U3); “they understand the task more quickly than others and after hearing recommendations for completing it, usually offer several alternatives” (U5); “ability to actively work” (U6); “love for training and development” (U7); “ability to self-organize, work towards a result, desire to learn” (U8)). The *Creativity* subcategory was distinguished by 4 LT (“creative

initiative” (M1); “creatively solve problems” (M5); “creativity” (M11); “creativity” (M14)) and 4 UA (“creativity” (U1); “creative approach to the implementation of tasks” (U2); “shows creativity” (U3); “creative thinking” (U7)) teachers. The *Critical thinking* subcategory was singled out by 3 LT (“critical thinking” (M13); “raising problematic questions and critical thinking” (M14); “finds connections between unrelated things, thinks critically” (M15)) and 3 UA (“critical thinking” (U1); “ability to analyse, draw conclusions, think critically” (U2); “critical thinking” (U7)) informants. The subcategory of *Individuality* was distinguished by 2 LT (“has one’s own opinion” (M2); “is distinguished by non-standard, but correct decisions” (M9)) and 4 UA (“extraordinariness and originality of thinking” (U1); “extraordinary” (U3); “valuable individual characteristic” (U4); “one’s own independent view of the world” (U7)) teachers. The following research data suggest that gymnasium teachers in both countries are able to recognize gifted students, following the same criteria.

In the second category, *Ways of educating gifted students*, 5 subcategories were identified: *Additional tasks*; *Individualized education*; *Participation in competitions, olympiads*; *Psychological support, motivation*; *Parental involvement*. *Additional tasks* subcategory was distinguished by 9 LT (“we work extra” (M1); “I provide more tasks” (M3); “additional tasks” (M4); “additional learning is recommended, practical assignments that help deepen knowledge are carried out” (M5); “additional tasks” (M7); “additional tasks outside the curriculum” (M8); “I assign additional tasks” (M11); “I assign additional more complex tasks” (M14); “give more complex tasks and they try to complete them” (M15)) and 3 UA (“additional tasks” (U4); “additional tasks are offered” (U5); “additional tasks of different types and different levels of complexity” (U8)) informants. The subcategory of *Individualized education* was singled out by 6 LT (“individual tasks are chosen” (M5); “I determine an individual learning style” (M6); “I always try to prepare some unconventional tasks” (M9); “determine learning style and individualize tasks” (M10); “I choose more difficult tasks” (M12); “I give individual tasks” (M13)) and 6 UA (“I give differentiated tasks” (U1); “possibility to work individually” (U2); “learning on the basis of the personal interest of the students, one’s abilities, individual interests” (U3); “individual learning” (U4); “individual approach” (U5); “orientation on individual preferences of the student” (U7)) research participants. *Participation in competitions, olympiads* subcategory was distinguished by 4 LT (“Olympiads, competitions” (M4); “it’s necessary to encourage participation in competitions, olympiads, etc.” (M6); “we’re preparing for olympiads” (M7); “I encourage to write research papers, I encourage to participate in competitions, olympiads” (M14)) and 3 UA (“I engage in participation in competitions, scientific-practical conferences, olympiads” (U1); “participation in Olympiads, competitions” (U4); “I invite to participate in competitions, exhibitions, festivals, olympiads” (U7)) informants. The subcategory of *Psychological support, motivation* was noted by



4 UA (“I motivate students” (U1); “I create situations of success, interest” (U3); “analysis of students’ progress and achievements; provision of psychological comfort to gifted students” (U4); “support – definitely note the smallest success” (U8)) teachers. *Parental involvement* subcategory was distinguished by 2 UA (“I work with the student’s parents: conversations about methods and conditions for the development of giftedness in the family” (U1); “advice concerning gifted students, recommendations for parents” (U4)) informants. Research data show that in the category *Ways of educating gifted students* it becomes clear that LT teachers apply such methods of education as additional tasks, individualized education, preparation of students to participate in competitions, olympiads, while UA teachers, in addition to the already mentioned methods, single out psychological support, motivation; parental involvement in the education of gifted students. The difference in the number of responses regarding the use of additional tasks in the education of gifted students between LT (9) and UA (3) informants should also be mentioned. It can be assumed that UA teachers use a wider range of educational methods, while LT teachers pay more and more detailed attention to individualized education and additional tasks to the gifted students.

In the third category, *Difficulties in education of gifted students*, 5 subcategories were distinguished: *Heavy student learning workload*; *Lack of teacher time*; *Lack of teacher knowledge on how to work with gifted students*; *Large number of students in the class*; *Need for professional development*; *Increased requirements for the teacher’s personality*. In the following category, LT teachers identified 3 subcategories: *Heavy student learning workload* (“gifted students are overloaded” (M1); “the student is overtired from the abundance of various activities” (M5); “student fatigue, heavy workload” (M7); “fatigue is one of educational problems” (M12); “as students themselves say, lack of time” (M13); “the workload is considerable and they fail to do something in due time” (M14)) – 6 informants; *Lack of teacher time* (“lack of time” (M7); “shortage of time” (M8); “separate preparation time is needed” (M15)) – 3 informants; *Large number of students in the class* (“too many students in classes” (M2); “large number of students in a class” (M3)) – 2 informants. In the category *Difficulties in education of gifted students*, UA teachers distinguished 2 subcategories: *Need for professional development* (“learn to work systematically and develop” (U2); “it’s necessary to constantly improve one’s skills” (U5); “the teacher needs to constantly improve the level of one’s knowledge” (U8)) – 3 informants. *Increased requirements for the teacher’s personality* (“teacher’s personality should display more love, guardianship and support and on a more frequent basis” (U3); “it’s necessary to pay attention to one’s personal qualities” (U4); “self-discipline appears” (U8)) – 3 informants. The responses of research participants showed that teachers face various difficulties in education of gifted students. The responses of the informants also revealed that LT teachers mostly associate difficulties in

education of gifted students with environmental factors, while UA teachers – with personal and professional factors.

Informants from both countries provided recommendations for the education of gifted students in schools. Suggestions of LT teachers were as follows: “notice gifted students and carry out purposeful educational activities with them” (M1); “attention and creativity of the teacher are necessary” (M2); “motivate gifted students” (M3); “avoid standard tasks, use programs for the education of gifted students” (M6); “creatively apply teaching methods when working with the gifted” (M10); “motivate gifted children to further improve, not to overshadow their personalities” (M11); “get to know and recognize a gifted child, advise and help one” (M12); “create a system of effective education of gifted students” (M15). UA research participants suggested: “timely early diagnosis and adequate perception of the peculiarities of your child” (U1); “creation of conditions for revealing the abilities of students; development of creative potential, self-realization; successful socialization” (U3); “it’s important for the teacher to be fair, emotionally stable, to be capable of self-analysis, self-criticism, revision of one’s positions, give children freedom of choice and decision-making” (U4); “to be able to find balance when working with gifted and other students in order to create a friendly, positive classroom atmosphere” (U5); “timely diagnosis will facilitate timely assistance” (U6); “to instil, also by one’s example, love for one’s profession” (U7); “the most important is the provision of resources, psychological and educational support” (U8).

## **Discussion and Conclusions**

Empirical research, which was based on the paradigm of differentiation and problematic questions about the criteria for identifying gifted students, methods of educating them, and educational difficulties, aimed to reveal opinion of gymnasium teachers about the peculiarities of education of gifted students in Lithuania and Ukraine.

It became clear during the research that teachers from both countries consider the following as the criteria for identifying gifted students: pursuit of knowledge; ability to learn; creativity; critical thinking; individuality. These and similar criteria for identifying gifted students are also distinguished by a number of studies (Survutaitė, 2022; Belska, 2022; Voloshuk, Gal'chenko, 2022; Dinichenko, 2000), which indicate that this recognition is associated with various and different manifestations of students’ talents; thus, the field of research is constantly expanding in order to maximize their potential and improve the quality of teaching. Researchers note that gymnasium teachers from both countries are able to recognize gifted students on the basis of the above-mentioned criteria for recognition. The following allows to claim that gifted students are noticed,

educational conditions that meet their needs are created, and the potential of these students' talents is developed.

Data of the conducted research on the methods of educating gifted students revealed that LT teachers use the following methods of education: additional tasks, individualized education, preparing students for participation in competition, olympiads. UA teachers also apply the above-mentioned methods, but also distinguish psychological support, motivation; parent involvement in the education of gifted students. Most studies (Reid & Boettger, 2015; Matheis et al., 2017; Khalikova & Khalikov, 2020) associate the choice of methods of education of gifted students with the personality of the teacher, one's professional abilities. It is worth mentioning that methods of educating gifted students provided by informants reveal the professional and personal preparation of teachers to work with gifted students professionally. The conducted research highlighted the differences between educational methods used by LT and UA teachers: UA teachers provided more and more diverse educational methods, while LT teachers focused more on the application of individual and additional educational methods. It is important to note that teachers who participated in the research are determined and motivated to achieve the ambitious goal of educating gifted students by using all educational methods available to them.

International studies (Cheung et al., 2022; Reid, Boettger, 2015) reveal that education of gifted students is often accompanied by difficulties: not always and not all gifted students are noticed, teachers do not have a wide choice of various educational strategies for gifted students, etc. The conducted research and its findings largely support this position. LT teachers who participated in the research presented difficulties related to environmental factors: heavy student learning workload; lack of teacher time; lack of teacher knowledge in working with gifted students; large number of students in the class; need for professional development; increased requirements for the teacher's personality. Meanwhile, UA teachers identified other difficulties related to personal and professional factors: continuous qualification improvement; high requirements for the teacher's personality, etc. The responses of the informants revealed differences between countries (LT and UA), which could be caused by the use of different criteria for identifying gifted students, methods of education, national educational traditions, etc. Nevertheless, researchers note that education of gifted students is a complex area that not only requires the efforts of teachers, but also appropriate attention of the wider education community.

The limitation of the qualitative research is related to the inevitable subjectivity in the qualitative research. Even though when planning and conducting the following research requirements for this type of research were met, the generalization of findings and possibilities of their application are limited in part by the small number of research participants. It is the results of qualitative research that are unique and specific to the individuals involved in the research.

It would be incorrect to apply the findings of the research to all LT and UA teachers, but it is likely that the opinion expressed by the participants of the following research provides an understanding of the challenges and opportunities of the education of gifted students in gymnasium, faced by teachers. Research results allow to predict continuity of the further research on the following phenomenon in order to find out the opinion of general education teachers by conducting quantitative research in both countries.

On the basis of theoretical insights and findings of the conducted research, in order to improve the quality of education of the gifted students, the researchers believe that it is important to ensure consistent, continuous, research-based development of students' talents; create opportunities and provide teachers with knowledge about the adaptation and modification of general programmes, thus enriching their content, differentiating and individualizing the teaching process; motivate teachers to improve their qualification in matters of education of gifted students; gather teams of specialists needed for the recognition, education, and motivation of talented students to improve. In summary, it can be concluded that gymnasium students are noticed by teachers and are educated in a variety of ways. Not all opportunities are used for the education of gifted students for different reasons in each (LT and UA) country. Teachers from both countries aim to educate talented gymnasium students by improving themselves, looking for the best educational methods, etc.

## References

- Androsovich, K. A. (2018). Problema socializacii obdarovanih uchniv v umovah osvityni ustanovi: vpliv social'nih merezh. *Osvita ta rozvitok obdarovanoi osobistosti*, 4 (71), 17–23. Retrieved from: <http://otr.iod.gov.ua/images/pdf/2018/4/06.pdf>
- Belska, N. (2022). Study of the Diagnostic Possibilities of the test Method of J. Oldham–L. Morris “Personal Self Portrait” for the Identification of Lyceum Students with Signs of Giftedness (part 1). *Education and Development of Gifted Personality: Quarterly Scientific-methodical Magazine*. Kyiv: Institute of Gifted Child of NAES of Ukraine, 3 (86), 101-116. DOI: [https://doi.org/10.32405/2309-3935-2022-3\(86\)-101-112](https://doi.org/10.32405/2309-3935-2022-3(86)-101-112)
- Cheung, A. Ch., Shek, D. T., Hui, A. N., Leung, K. H., and Cheung, R. S. (2022). Professional Development for Teachers of Gifted Education in Hong Kong: Instrument Validation and Training Effectiveness. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, 19(15), 1-19. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph19159433>
- Creswell, J. W. (2014). *Research design: quantitative, qualitative and mixed methods approaches (4th ed.)*. London: Sage.
- Dai, D. Y., Chen, F. (2013). Three Paradigms of Gifted Education: In Search of Conceptual Clarity in Research and Practice. *Gifted Child Quarterly*. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1177/0016986213490020>
- Dinichenko, L. (2000). Robota z obdarovanimi dit'mi abo sproba zasvityti zirku. *Ridna shkola*, 5. 77-80.
- Gaižauskaitė, I., Valavičienė, N. (2016). *Socialinių tyrimų metodai: kokybinis interviu*. Vilnius: Registrų centras.

- Holod, I. V. (2014). Formi pedagogichnoï pidtrimki obdarovanoï students'koï molodi u Velikobritanii. *Pedagogichni nauki: teorija, istorija, innovacijni tehnologii*, 10 (44), 209-216.
- Janlin', U. (2018). Koncept «obdarovanosti» v suchasnij KNR. *Suchasna pedagogika: teorija, metodika, praktika*, 17 (25), 22-25. Retrieved from: <http://molodyvcheny.in.ua/files/conf/ped/31sept2018/31sept2018.pdf>
- Khalikova, F. D., & Khalikov, A. V. (2020). Prospects of the 21st Century Teacher's Training to Work with Gifted Children. *VI International Forum on Teacher Education Proceedings*, 1027-1037. DOI: 10.3897/ap.2.e1027
- Matheis, S., Kronborg, L., Schmittb, M., & Preckel, F. (2017). Threat or challenge? Teacher beliefs about gifted students and their relationship to teacher motivation. *Gifted and Talented International*, 32(2), 134–160.
- Neber, H. (2020). Educating the Gifted: An Opportunity for Improving the Quality of Teaching and Learning in Classrooms. *International Journal for Talent Development and Creativity*, 8(1), 48-60. Retrieved from: <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1297547.pdf>
- Papak, P. P., Arrigoni, J., Ivković, Ž. (2018). Relationship between Encouraging Excellence in Pupils and Teachers' Attitudes towards Science: An Example from Croatia. *Teaching Gifted and Talented Children in a New Educational Era*. Retrieved from: <https://zalozba.upr.si/ISBN/978-961-7055-22-1.pdf>
- Tallinn European School. (2021). *Policy on the Provision of Educational Support and Inclusive Education in the European Schools*. Amendment of the Policy approved the Board of Governors of the European Schools. Schola Europaea / Office of the Secretary General. Retrieved from: <https://www.eursec.eu/Documents/2012-05-D-14-en-10.pdf>
- Reid, E., & Boettger, H. (2015). Gifted Education in Various Countries of Europe. *Slavonic Pedagogical Studies Journal*. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.18355/PG.2015.4.2.158-171>
- Rutigliano, A., & Quarshie, N. (2021). Policy approaches and initiatives for the inclusion of gifted students in OECD countries. *OECD Education Working Paper No. 262*. *OECDiLibrary*. Retrieved from: <https://www.oecd-ilibrary.org/docserver/c3f9ed87-en.pdf?expires=1651157734&id=id&accname=guest&checksum=7CDC22FDFDECC2F4AF146C85BA9E19B7>
- Survutaitė, D. (2022). Gabių ar (ir) talentingų vaikų ugdymas. *Švietimo problemas analizė*, 4 (201). Retrieved from: <https://www.nsa.smm.lt/wp-content/uploads/2022/07/Gabiu-ar-ir-talentingu-vaiku-ugdymas-2022-birzelis-Nr.-4-2022-07-18.pdf>
- Valiušytė, K., & Lamanauskas, V. (2021). Gabių mokinių ugdymo organizavimas bendrojo ugdymo mokyklose: mokytojai (Organization of gifted student's education in comprehensive schools: teacher's position). *Švietimas: politika, vadyba, kokybė (Education Policy, Management and Quality)*, 13(1), 22–38. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.48127/spvk-epmq/21.13.22>
- Voloshhuk, I. S., & Gal'chenko, M. S. (2022). *Obdarovani diti. Enciklopedija Suchasnoï Ukraïni*. Kiïv: Institut enciklopedichnih doslidzhen' NAN Ukraïni, 24. Retrieved from: <https://esu.com.ua/article-74529>
- Wiles, R. (2012). *What are qualitative research ethics?* London: Bloomsbury Publishing.
- Žydžiūnaitė, V. & Sabaliauskas, S. (2017). *Kokybiniai tyrimai: principai ir metodai*. Vilnius: Vaga.