

Editorial

The Turkish Journal of Giftedness and Education is now under a new name “TALENT.” The decision for the change of the title was based on sound reasons. I think that the concept of “gifted education” is rather narrow in its scope and becoming outdated as our conceptions of talent and giftedness have dramatically changed in the last fifty years. By changing the title, we will target at all talent fields, from academics to sports and others that will emerge in the future. Thus, from now on, we will have a different vision on publishing Talent. We will focus on rigorous scientific research and evidence-based practices on the development of talent and creativity.

I am happy that Joseph S. Renzulli wrote a leading article for the 10th volume and the first issue of Talent. In his article, he proposes the production of social capital in gifted education. Although social capital is not a new concept in some fields, it is rather new in gifted education. Thus, Renzulli opens up a new gate for researchers in gifted education and talent development. He carries out a powerful discussion on his model “Operation Houndstooth” and social capital and examines the relationship between the characteristics of gifted leaders and their motivation to produce social capital. I think that we have overemphasized intellectual capital and underemphasized social capital. The irony is that we probably have more social problems than scientific and technological problems.

In another study, April Walker and Todd Kettler investigated the effect of a debate intervention on students’ critical thinking. They found that high-ability students benefited more from the intervention than did general education students. Based on findings, they suggested a possible aptitude-treatment interaction or the Matthew effect.

Christine Ireland, Terence V. Bowles, Kimberley A. Brindle and Susan Nikakis investigated differences between teachers’ and students’ perceptions of curriculum differentiation strategies to extend highly able students in mixed-ability secondary science classes in Australia. Because of differences between teachers’ and students’ perceptions of curriculum differentiation, the researchers suggested further research on curriculum differentiation that includes students’ perspectives.

Necati Bilgiç and Ayşegül Ataman evaluated the decisions related to talent education made in the Congresses of the Ministry of National Education in Turkey since 1938. The research obviously requires a lot of work. In their analyses, they found that decisions were not system-based but person-based and not sustainable and were shaped by government politics.

Hasan Akdeniz and Gülgün Bangir Alpan investigated talented students’ creative problem solving styles. They found that students preferred conceptualizer style, generator style, optimizer style, and implementer style. Their styles differed according to their talent areas.

Lastly, Seraceddin Levent Zorluoğlu, Yasemin Çetin, Aybüke Aşık, Zeynep Nur Gündüz and Hüseyin Mertol carried out a research study on what teachers of talented students used as measurement and evaluation tools and methods. They found that teachers did not use any specific tools or methods rather they employed alternative methods to assess talent students.

Enjoy your readings and be safe in COVID-19 days!

Ugur Sak
Founding Editor