

Labeling of gifted children in the family from the perspective of teachers and its manifestations at school

Abstract: The paper presents the results of a study exploring the structure of labeling gifted children and its effects on the family environment from the perspective of teachers. The study, which was carried out based on a focus group of 19 teachers from the Czech Republic, covered aspects of classroom teaching as well as communications with the parents of gifted children. Qualitative data was analyzed by open and axial coding. The results show that parents have fear of child identification at the counselling center because of formalization this process. Following the identification of giftedness, the teachers recorded changes in the attitudes of children and parents. In the case of the children, the internalization of typical characteristics of this population occurs in both a negative and positive sense. The teachers indicated 2 attitudes in the parents: they either exaggerated the child's giftedness, which sometimes led to interference with the curriculum of educators, or they approached the giftedness with fear, with both of these positions reflecting susceptibility to certain myths on giftedness. Upon transition of the child from ISCED 1 to 2, we registered the tendency of the parents to underrate the negative consequences of labeling. The elimination of labelling is passive (not professional), i.e. by coming to ignore or deviate from institutional practices and procedures put in place to enhance the development of giftedness.

Keywords: gifted child, parent of a gifted child, teacher of a gifted pupil, labeling, focus group.

Mgr. Eva Klimecká, Ph.D., researcher, email: machu@utb.cz. Address of authors: Research Centre of FoH, Faculty of Humanities, Tomas Bata University in Zlin, Štefánikova 5760, 76001 Zlín, The Czech Republic.

Introduction

The family environment plays an inimitable role in the development of giftedness, evidence for which can be seen in giftedness models. In both Mönks' Multifactor Model of Giftedness and Gagné's Differentiated Model of Giftedness and Talent (Pfeiffer, 2015), the family was shown to be a key factor of giftedness.

It is necessary to keep in mind that the development of care for the gifted individual has also been linked to negative consequences. These problems are related to an inadequate understanding of the "gifted" label, resulting in social isolation of gifted children or a negative change in their social and emotional development.

The detection of the causes and consequences of the negative aspects of the gifted label is generally focused on the school environment (see Clark, 2013; Gates, 2010; Heward, 2013), or the peer environment (Cross and Coleman, 1993). Analysis of the family environment of gifted children in connection with the issue of labeling has generally remained outside the focus of interest. However, in her longitudinal studies J. Freeman (2013) has drawn attention to the importance of labeling within the family environment. Another research from family environment has been conducted by Schilling, Sparfeldt and Detlef, 2006; Ziegler and Stoeger, 2010; Olszewski-Kubilius et al. 2014; and Yildiz et al. 2019.

The objective of our research is to explore the structure of the labeling of gifted children within the family environment on the basis of its ramifications on school teaching and on the communications of the teacher with the parents of gifted children. We sought to broadly examine the situation from the view of the teachers who come into intensive contact with gifted children. We assume that in consequence of the collaboration among families and schools, the pupil manifests certain signs of labeling modelled from the family environment.

The conception of giftedness

Based on the Heward and Ford (2013), we define giftedness as the heightened ability of an individual within a selected area valued by the sociocultural environment which is targeted to be quantitatively and qualitatively more developed as compared with her / his peers. We also base our definition on the concepts of demonstrated performance as well as multi-dimensionality, i.e. the child manifests signs of giftedness, and has undergone a comprehensive diagnostics of the projected giftedness (see Dai, 2009).

A gifted child in our research is one who manifests signs of intellectual giftedness and has undergone formal in-depth pedagogical-psychological identification of giftedness. The formal identification of giftedness in the Czech Republic is formed by Education Counselling facilities (see NUV, 2018). The assumption for initiation of the formal identification is a consent with a legal guardian of a child. Based on the output of the identification, within the school the pupil is placed into one of 4 levels, i.e. supportive measures are taken which define the quality and quantity of curriculum modification (Tomlinson, 2013). The formal process of identification ensures formal obligations both to the school and to the counselling centers (e.g. the creation, application and evaluation of individual learning contracts; see VUP, 2007, pp 115 - 116). Informal ways of identifying giftedness also exist, the outputs of which cannot be recognized formally.

According to Giftedness Strategy 2020 (MSMT, 2014) the inclusion is a dominant direction of the development of programs for gifted children in the Czech Republic. The most gifted pupils receive education at inclusive schools. When these pupils enter educational level

ISCED 2 they are given the option of studying at lower secondary schools which feature certain attributes of selectiveness.

Labeling of gifted children

Labeling theory focuses on the process of assigning labels to a student during the course of an evaluation of the individual's characteristics, skills, and abilities. Once a label has been assigned, the attitudes of the professionals who come to contact with the individual changes. The attitude of the broader social public shifts as well, e.g. often exclusion and an unwelcome change of self-identity appear, which can lead to stigmatization. (Matsueda, 2014)

Conditioned by the official identification, the gifted label applied to students is acted upon and its projected characteristics expanded upon by a set of subjects which seek to develop the giftedness of the individual, and / or to enhance the learning materials and strategies of the subjects that the individual studies. The giftedness label comes to be internalized by the child not only in the school, family and peer areas, but also in the broader the public arena. (Gates 2010)

The unique cognitive, social and emotional characteristics which gifted children are identified with result in the attempt to meet putative specific educational and instructional needs. Some of these typical but (potentially) negative characteristics may include emotional intensity, perfectionism, avoidance of risks, extensive self-criticism, underachievement, rejection of giftedness, depression, and exclusion from team identification and group activities (Zakreski, 2018). Supporters of the labeling theory in this context contend that these typical problems of gifted children would not exist without the stigma attached to the label (Barab and Plucker 2002).

Brigham Heward and Ford (2013) claim that, while labeling is an unavoidable part of the care of the gifted, changes in the curriculum for the gifted should be applied ethically, professionally, and purposefully (Gates, 2010).

Labeling of gifted children in the family environment

Gifted children may not feel comfortable with this label, a discomfort which is manifested mainly in their communication with peers and in the broader social environment (Robinson, 1990; Cross and Coleman, 1993).

Not only gifted persons themselves, but also their families associate negative meanings with the label. Matthews et al. (2014) ascertained that the parents of gifted children avoid the presentation of their children's giftedness before the parents of non-gifted children for fear of being judged. It was further ascertained that the parents of gifted children preferred to share information about the giftedness with other parents of gifted children.

The labeling process also transforms the specific attitudes of the parents to the education of gifted children, which may also be reflected in the personalities of the children. Parents have come to expect that the formal identification of giftedness brings with it an increased probability of emotional disturbance (Freeman, 2013). Study by Eren et al. (2018) highlights, for instance, the assumption of parents that their gifted children will perform very high academically, as well as experience greater emotional intensity and social isolation.

Wirthwein et al. (2019) ascertained how the parents evaluate their children in terms of personality and academic characteristics. The parents of adolescents labeled as gifted rated their children higher on motivation, intelligence, self-concept, school results and general knowledge than did the parents of adolescents not labeled as gifted.

In research by Ziegler and Stoeger (2010), parents who labeled their children as gifted were themselves found to be more achievement-oriented and they tended to diminish their children's emotional expression, typically producing less well-adjusted children than non-labeling parents. Matthews et al. (2014) also state that the parents of identified gifted children perceive a level of emotional sensitivity and social specificity in their children.

Concerning the general attitudes of the parents of identified gifted children, giftedness is associated with the presumption that such children come from sound and supportive domestic backgrounds, since as they see it the manifestation of giftedness does not occur in a passive environment. Moreover, according to McCoach and Siegle (2007) variables exist which form the positive attitudes to giftedness, and the family of a gifted child logically assumes that their child manifests several specific characteristics to which parents should respond, e.g. maintaining more intensive contact with the gifted child as well as the perception of the self or the individual as a gifted person. Other characteristics related to these parents such as higher education, higher socio-economic status, and participation in life-long education appear often in research studies.

Methodology

Aim of research

The objective of the research was to examine the process of labeling gifted children in the family environment on the basis of the manifestations of certain characteristics observed in the course of school teaching and in communications between the teacher and parents of (potentially) gifted children. We examined the entire situation from the viewpoint of the teachers who come into contact with identified gifted children and their parents.

Participants

19 primary school teachers from the Zlín Region of the Czech Republic participated in the research survey, of whom 15 were women and 4 men. These teachers currently work with identified intellectually gifted pupils in their classes. All the participants were qualified teachers and worked mainly at the ISCED 1 level. Teachers came from schools which were members of National network of giftedness support (MŠMT, 2014). The aim of this membership is active cooperation and sharing information about giftedness in the. These teachers are usually dealing with giftedness at their schools (at the position of school counsellors or giftedness support coordinators).

Data collection

We conducted the qualitative research in the form 2 face-to-face unstructured focus groups (Carey and Asbury, 2012) with a total of 19 respondents, with meeting in the first half of 2019. Interviews were conducted in relation to the research problem. The main topics were: initiation of identification process in cooperation with parents; process of identification; setting the individual educational plan in cooperation with child and parents, realization of the individual educational plan and its progress. The interview time allocation was 60 minutes. Response to the interview questions were voluntary for the participants. Individual and group

attitudes were ascertained. Interactions among group members were reflected in the data gathering (see Hancock et al. 2016).

Data analysis

A qualitative analysis of the obtained answers was conducted in the data processing. In our survey we used selected techniques of the grounded theory, open coding and axial coding (Charmaz, 2006). Firstly, electronic transcripts of the interviews were made, following which significance segments were identified in the texts and marked with codes. This was followed by a grouping of the codes into categories of similar significance, the recurrent renaming of the codes and reorganization of categories, allocation of the most important major categories along with description and explanation.

We tried to increase data validation by investigator triangulation (Archibald, 2015). The data was analyzed by 2 researchers. They coded separately during identification of significant segments and marking them with codes. Then they worked together to establish coding procedure and find categories during axial coding.

Findings

The qualitative analysis revealed to us several partial and major thematic categories. Certain context emerged among the categories which signposted the process of labeling of gifted children in the family environment as well as manifestations of the label in school teaching.

Identification of giftedness

In accordance with labeling theory, the major categories were retained in our research design.

Interest in informal identification: Teachers consider the informal identification of giftedness in the child as being highly desirable among parents, who can then receive their first official feedback that their child has manifested signs of giftedness. Thus the parents' assumptions regarding the quality and scope of the giftedness as well as the subsequent developmental issues involved are confirmed. The quoted passages here and below are translations of the comments of teachers regarding their experiences with parents.

“The parents are interested in identification, they are curious; it is also considered modern to know; they want to get confirmation that the child is gifted, and at present they have only compared the child to the children of their friends. They want to get assurance that they shall further provide proper guidance to the child.”

“The families have a huge interest in tests given at Mensa; They also have a huge interest in the *identification* which we perform ourselves in our school.”

Fear of identification at the counselling center: The teachers have ascertained that the formal *identification* of giftedness in Education Counselling Facilities is greatly feared by parents due to the ensuing formal obligations to the school and the counselling center that the parents will have to fulfill.

“They tell us that the informal confirmation (of giftedness) which is provided in our school suffices for them; they do not want to deal with counselling centers and do not want to incessantly psychologize the child; an examination at the counselling center is not popular;

the parents are afraid of a positive identification, as they do not know what to expect. They are afraid of the official obligations involved.”

A visible change occurring

A further category represents teacher testimonies that describe certain changes in the behavior of formally identified gifted children which reflects the attitudes of their parents.

First meeting after formal identification: Like the school, the family is interested in consulting the diagnostic authorities regarding results in order to define the changes that will take place in the education of the gifted pupil. In these meetings, the parents are provided with advanced advice regarding the issue, with mothers in particular generally showing a strong interest in delineating the educational conditions suitable for their child.

“After the results of the identification are obtained, we (teachers) immediately make contact; most parents collaborate with us even prior to counselling, and we regularly discuss their child and options for the development of their giftedness. Mainly mothers communicate with us; these women are themselves more intellectually gifted and better informed, e.g. with more accurate and recent information about giftedness. They know quite a lot about intelligence, about what the gifted do, how they behave and what they need.”

Internalization of “typical” characteristics of the gifted: The pupil is gradually accepting her / his status as a gifted pupil, which affects the entire personality of the child, including cognitive and affective aspects. The cognitive signs of giftedness strengthen; the child is more motivated and active; he/she demonstrates qualities of giftedness more frequently. On the other hand, the pupils internalize and deepen inappropriate behavior characteristics which are precipitously explained by the parents as typical signs of giftedness, as indicated by the respondents.

“All of a sudden, it seems to us that the pupils are beginning to behave differently in school. It’s as if the change occurred overnight. They have greater motivation, more learning zeal.”

“But their parents incessantly justify their children’s unacceptable behavior. I have the feeling that what was earlier considered as negative is suddenly now excused by the identification. Out of nowhere, misconduct is taken by the parents to be an expression of exceptionalness is an expression of giftedness.”

Educational needs from the pupil’s viewpoint: Not only the parents but also the gifted children become well-informed regarding giftedness. According to the teachers, however, students quite often unsuitably adapt themselves to the teaching requirements. If the children’s immediate desires are not accommodated, they revolt against the teacher. The children begin labeling themselves as “gifted” in their own discourse.

“It is clear from the pupils that the parents talk a lot about the issue at home. Even the children know a lot about giftedness, they are little psychologists; one boy started revolting against me quite a lot. He told me that he was gifted and the gifted don’t have to repeat school exercises; they refuse to cooperate, and expect special treatment as compared with their peers, which is impossible in terms of teaching.”

“For instance, a pupil completely refused to allow me to write a note in his exercise book, saying that doing so is not for the gifted.”

Assumption and demanding good marks: For identified gifted children, there is a tendency to start assuming favorable educational results. The children themselves make an effort to earn good marks and they are exposed to a greater number of external motivation elements in the home environment. Receiving inferior marks is sometimes attributed by the parents as the fault of the teacher. On the other hand, one of the respondents admits that the teachers may also be susceptible to pressure from the giftedness label, and they themselves assume that the gifted pupil will naturally achieve better results.

“Children must get excellent marks at all costs, but sometimes this is not the case. When they get a low mark, they cry and say that if the mark stands their father would scold them or not buy them one thing or another, or that they will not be admitted to some school in the future.”

“The parents thus often search for errors in us, for example that we are incapable of transferring the learning content in an interesting manner, or that we are poor at testing, which they blame the lack of excellent marks on; but I have read a study that identification of giftedness improves their study results immediately. So honestly, are we not extending privileges to these children? Are we not afraid that we are doing something wrong ourselves when they get poor marks?”

Development and fear of the development of giftedness

Regarding the development of the giftedness of children, the results from our group of teachers generally reflect two opinions. The parents either themselves attempt to develop the child intensively in a specific gifted area to aid the student in her / his efforts, for instance even to the point of interfering with teaching taking place at school. The other tendency is an opposite reaction from parents, i.e. to approach the development of giftedness with trepidation or even fear in order not to spoil the results of child's schooling.

Development exclusively in the area of giftedness: Even if the identification at a counselling center is comprehensive, the parents often focus on the development of the child in one of the more pronounced areas of her / his giftedness. They somewhat forget about the other elements of the child's personality.

“Quite often the parents blindly see only the giftedness and forget about everything else; They do not see that he is perhaps weaker in language, they constantly focus only on mathematics and logic, which the child is gifted in. And in this area, they make an effort to overburden the child. He likely also has other extra-curricular activities related to mathematics. It is necessary to realize that each person is good at something and that the gifted child at age of eight does possess self-service skills.”

The need of the parents to intervene in teaching: According to the teachers, many parents are members of associations concerned with giftedness. The teachers perceive some of the actions of these associations negatively, particularly, those that lead to the parents' excessive interference with school teaching. In addition, besides parents, other family members who are aware of the issues involved may be adversely affected.

“The parents frequently visit a local club for gifted children and their parents. I personally see negative consequences from this in some the parents actions. They bring me various worksheets from the clubs which they insist I give to their son during our lessons. I try to explain to them to no avail that this is unsuitable in the lessons and they should engage in these activities outside school time.”

“Grandmothers – former educators themselves – are typical in this aspect. They come to our class and instead of just observing the progress of the lesson, they become impatient and intervene in the activities.“ „A colleague has a problem with a mother who presented herself as a member of Mensa. She wanted to be informed about everything that took place in school and somehow found problems with everything.”

The important thing is not to mess up: The teachers also perceived the opposite tendency in some parents, specifically fears concerning the development of the giftedness of their children. They seek to preserve their son or daughter’s childhood, and they do not want learning material designed for older students administered to their children.

“This also includes parents who after an initial feeling of elation begin to fear aspects of the development of the giftedness of own children. They present the argument that if pushed the children would lose their childhood, that they would grow up too quickly and be left only with the obligations that await them in adulthood. They are afraid that they would destroy something by making this change.”

Future plans and reality

Even if the parents are more or less satisfied with the current school, they eventually become interested in the placement of their child in a lower secondary school (ISCED 2). If the pupil continues at the same school to the next class / grade, the teachers often register the family’s loss of interest in the child’s giftedness and in retaining communication with the teacher. The autonomous development of giftedness is entrusted more to the child.

Transition to lower secondary school: Lower secondary schools are characterized by a certain preference for selecting of children with a greater potential for development, with the parents perceiving this tendency as a suitable for the further development of their own child’s giftedness.

“They often plan their children’s transition to lower secondary school. At the upper primary school level, we retain hardly any children with a gifted certification.”

Less interest as the child gets older: At upper primary schools, the responsibility for development of the giftedness is largely transferred to the child. The family’s need to communicate with the school substantially declines. The parents generally abandon the extension of identification in the counselling center, which according to the teachers creates increasing demands for the development of giftedness in the home environment.

“My experience is that such interest on the part of the parents gradually declines at the upper primary school level. The need to communicate with the teachers also declines substantially. Their child maintains relatively good marks, so there is nothing to resolve. At upper primary school level, this already becomes slightly more complicated, as the number of subjects is greater and more teachers are involved. We place higher demands on these pupils. Yet nothing goes well without help from the parents with their child’s homework. This is perhaps another reason parents should be willing to extend their child’s diagnosis at the counselling center.”

Summary, discussion and research limits

The objective of this research was to explore the structure of labeling intellectually gifted children within the family environment on the basis of its manifestations in school teaching and communications of the teachers with the parents of gifted children, with the ramifications of the labeling process described from the view of the teachers.

1. Identification of giftedness	Interest in informal identification Fear of identification at the counselling center
2. A visible change occurring	First meeting after formal identification Internalization of “typical” characteristics of the gifted Educational needs from the pupil’s viewpoint Assumption and demanding good marks
3. Development and fear of the development of giftedness	Development exclusively in the area of giftedness The need of the parents to intervene in teaching The important thing is not to mess up
4. Future plans and reality	Transition to lower secondary school Less interest as the child gets older

Table 1: Major and partial thematic categories

Ad 1) As in Matthews (2014), ascertained that the parents indicate an initial interest in the identification of giftedness and want to learn more about the giftedness of their children. However, in teachers opinion, they are interested in its informal variant. Parents are fearful of formal identification, as they are reluctant to assume formal obligations to the institutions involved. The answers of the teachers we surveyed also indicate a parents fear regarding the incessant psychologization of the child as well as trepidations concerning explanations to uninformed parents of the ramifications their child’s giftedness. We also agree with this author that it is very important for the parents to actively share experiences with the parents of other gifted children.

Ad 2) According to our findings, after the formal identification of giftedness, changes occur in the attitudes and behavior of the children and / or their parents. From some researches (Gottfried et al. 2005), it follows that these changes in the attitudes generally become obvious after the inclusion of the children in a gifted program. Other researches (Matthew, 2009; Gibbons et al. 1994), however, do not register any differences prior to nor after inclusion in a gifted program. These cases concerned summer programs with limited time intervals. It is therefore possible to assume that changes in the attitudes of the gifted are triggered only after the inclusion of children in development programs with a longer term perspective.

The following changes were ascertained immediately after acceptance of the label: the teachers registered a change in the personalities of the children characterized by the internalization of the typical characteristics of the gifted, including manifestations in the cognitive , affective and social areas in both negative and positive ways. Here self-labeling (Gates, 2010) comes into play along with the internalization of the generally applicable attitudes to giftedness (Barab and Plucker, 2002; Leavitt, 2017).

Further manifestations confirm the acceptance of the gifted label by the pupils. The teachers acknowledge that the gifted children, like their parents, acquire an extensive knowledge of giftedness. According to teachers, the gifted children come to adapt their education needs in unsuitable ways; they demand special treatment and if such demands are not met they revolt against the teacher. The children internalize the label and come to refer to themselves as “gifted.” These children generally now make a greater effort to get earn marks, and they are exposed to a greater number of external motivation elements in the home environment. The teachers admit that in this respect they themselves may give in to labeling pressure and give

the gifted pupil better marks. According to labelling theory (see above), these behaviors are manifested in educators either as an unconscious error in the social perception of the gifted pupil (Brigham and Bakkem, 2014), or as a conscious attribution of better marks from teachers with a poorer pedagogical self-assessment, which may be caused by a lack of general teaching experience and / or by a (perceived) lack of training and experience in working with gifted pupils (Kočvarová et al. 2017).

If we summarize this category, it is possible to assume that gifted children internalize the attitudes of their parents towards their giftedness. Like their parents, the children focus on achievement oriented goals, such as the assumption that they simply possess higher intelligence (Wirthwein et al. 2019; Ziegler and Stoeger, 2010). Further, both children and parents internalize the assumption of the relationship of giftedness with emotional intensity and social isolation (Ritchotte and Jolly, 2014; Eren et al. 2018).

Ad 3) Regarding the further development of children, the teachers reflect two attitudes of the parents, who either disproportionally exaggerate the processes involved in enhancing the child's giftedness, or approach giftedness with fear. In the first case, the parents assume that their child will perform academically at very high level (Eren et al. 2018). In our research, the parents focused on the development of the child in one major component of giftedness, while other areas were pushed into the background. According to the teachers, some parents want to take control of the education and training of their children to the point that they even excessively interfere with the competences of the teacher. The counter-pole to such attitudes are those of the parents that reflect susceptibility to common myths regarding giftedness, e.g. "the gifted need not learn how to read, write and count at pre-school age otherwise they shall be bored in school" (Carp, 2017).

Ad 4) In time, particularly upon the child entering a higher educational level a larger share of the responsibility for the development of giftedness is transferred to the child, with some parents also noting a decrease in the outward interest of teachers in development of their child. This transition of autonomy to child significantly reduces the need for the family to communicate with the school. The parents abandon the extension of diagnostics in the counselling center, which according to the teachers is related to the increasing demands to work with the gifted child in the home environment, and the unwillingness for the gifted child to work in formal institutions outside the home. Other parents at this time place their children in lower secondary schools, a step which the parents perceive as a new path towards the further development of giftedness. At this point, the repetition of the formal diagnosis is the exception rather than the rule, since due to the exclusivity of the pupils selected, programs for the enrichment and acceleration of the school curriculum are already in place. We thus ascertain that the giftedness label and its consequences become more undesirable upon the child's entry into adolescence (Robinson, 1990).

The research has also revealed a certain tendency towards attempts at reducing and alleviating the negative consequences of labeling. Unfortunately, this process is passive, i.e. it generally occurs through the deviation from formal identification and the formal development of giftedness. In contrast to these tendencies, the negative consequences of labeling should be eliminated by targeted teaching and psychological procedures based on ethics and professionalism (Heward and Ford, 2013).

We have attempted to examine labeling from an under-researched perspective, the consequences of the label of gifted within the family environment from the point of view of teachers. A number of rather negative consequences resulting from labeling were revealed, some which the parents themselves would be unaware of or unwilling to comment upon, e.g.

instances of excessive interference with teaching, as well as the assumption and even the demand that their children will receive good marks.

Limitations of the study

The first possible shortcoming is the context in which the labeling was monitored. We were only concerned with the children identified as gifted for the first time. It is clear that with children who have formally been labeled in this manner several times over the course of their educational track, the consequences of labeling are stronger than is the case with gifted children who have not undergone this entire process. The results can be applied only to the presented context.

A further limitation involves the selection of educators for the focus group. The criteria chosen substantially influenced the attitudes to giftedness that we found, i.e. these observations and opinions came strictly from teachers who have worked with gifted pupils. We assume that these teachers approach the presented topic with a much more positive attitude than would be the case with a more broadly representative selected target group. Another factor leading to the affirmative outcomes, although not necessarily a dominant one, is that our respondents consisted predominantly of women, who according to Bégin and Gagné (1994) display a more positive attitude to giftedness. Considering the entire group of respondents, however, they generally exhibited a positive attitude to giftedness, showing such established variables as having or maintaining intensive contact with a gifted child, relevant university education, and participation in life-long education in relation to the issue of giftedness (McCoach and Siegle, 2007).

Further limitations stem from the type of data collection and analysis of the results. A researcher approaches a study with certain assumptions which may consciously or unconsciously influence the design and execution content of interviews by the researcher. Similarly, data analysis may also be prone to elements of subjectivity. To attempt to alleviate potential bias, it was decided that the data would be analyzed jointly by two researchers, who would thus arrive at a certain compromise in the designation of the codes and the allocation of categories. On the other hand, the subjectivity of the researcher who has been trained in the issue has been perceived in most cases positively, as the researcher's experience facilitates situations of theoretical saturation (Clarke, 2015).

The research limitations may be partially eliminated with subsequent qualitative research, which would be based on interviews with the parents and / or pupils, or by the observation of the pupils in the home or school environment.

Conclusion

We examine the process of labeling gifted children in the family from the perspective of teachers. The main results show that parents have fear of child identification at the counselling center because of formalization this process. Following the identification of giftedness, the teachers recorded changes in the attitudes of children and parents. Upon transition of the child from ISCED 1 to 2, we registered the tendency of the parents to underrate the negative consequences of labelling by coming to ignore or deviate from institutional practices and procedures put in place to enhance the development of giftedness.

Labeling has positive and negative consequences. The elimination of these potential negative consequences should be undertaken through the professional and ethical treatment (not by ignoring specific needs of gifted individuals). The results of the study highlight the need for professional work with parents of gifted children.

References

- Archibald, M. M. (2015). Investigator Triangulation: A Collaborative Strategy With Potential for Mixed Methods Research. *Journal of Mixed Methods Research*, 10, issue 3, pp. 228-250.
- Barab, S. A. & Plucker, J. A. (2002). Smart People or Smart Context? Cognition, Ability, and Talent Development in an Age of Situated Approaches to Knowing and Learning. *Educational Psychologist*, 37, issue 5, pp. 165 – 182.
- Bégin, J. & Gagné, F. (1994). Predictors of attitudes toward gifted education: A review of the literature and blueprints for future research. *Journal for the Education of the Gifted*, 17, issue 2, pp. 161 – 179.
- Brigham, F. J. & Bakken, J. P. (2014). Assessment of Individuals who are Gifted and Talented. In: A. F. Rotatori, J. P. Bakken, F. E. Obiakor (eds.). *Gifted Education: Current Perspectives and Issues*. UK: Emerald, pp. 21 – 40.
- Carey, M. A. & Asbury, J. E. (2012). *Focus Group Research*. London: Routledge.
- Carp, A. (2017). Some thoughts on gifted education and creativity. *International Journal on Mathematics Education*, 49, issue 1, pp. 159-168.
- Clark, B. (2013). *Growing up Gifted: developing the Potential of Children at School and at Home*. NJ: Pearson.
- Clarke, A. (2015). From Grounded theory to situational analysis. What's new? Why? How? In J. M. Morse (ed.). *Developing grounded theory*. NY: Left Coast Press, pp. 194 – 235.
- Cross, T. L. & Coleman, L. J. (1993). The social cognition of gifted adolescents: an exploration of the stigma of giftedness paradigm. *Roepper Review*, 16, issue 1, pp. 37 – 40.
- Dai, D. Y. (2009). Essential Tensions Surrounding the Concept of Giftedness. In L. V. Shavinina. *International Handbook on Giftedness*. USA: Springer, pp. 39 – 80.
- Eren, F., Ömerelli Çete, A., Avcil, S. & Baykara, B. (2018). Emotional and Behavioral Characteristics of Gifted Children and Their Families. *Arch Neuropsychiatry*, 55, pp. 105–112.
- Freeman, J. (2013). The long-term effects of families and educational provision on gifted children. *Education and Child Psychology*, 30, issue 2, pp. 7 – 17.
- Gates, J. (2010). Children with Gifts and Talents: Looking Beyond Traditional Labels. *Roepper Review*, 32, issue 3, pp. 200 - 206.
- Gibbons, F. X., Benbow, C. P., & Gerrard, M. (1994). From top dog to bottom half: Social comparison strategies in response to poor performance. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 67, issue 4, pp. 638-652.

- Gottfried, A. W., Cook, C. R., & Gottfried, A. E. (2005). Educational Characteristics of Adolescents With Gifted Academic Intrinsic Motivation. *Gifted Child Quarterly*, 49, issue 2, pp. 172–186.
- Hancock, M. E., Amankwaa, L., Revell, M. A., & Mueller, D. (2016). Focus Group Data Saturation: A New Approach to Data Analysis. *The Qualitative Report*, 21, issue 11, pp. 2124-2130.
- Heward, W. L., & Ford, D. Y. (2013) Gifted and Talented. In W. L. Heward (ed.). *Exceptional Children. An Introduction to Special Education*. Ohio: Pearson Education, pp. 453 – 491.
- Charmaz, K. (2006). *Constructing Grounded Theory: A Practical Guide through Qualitative Analysis*. London: Sage.
- Kočvarová, I., Machů, E. & Petrůjová J. (2017). Self-assessment of teachers working with gifted pupils in terms of their work experience and education. *Proceedings of ICERI2016 Conference 14th-16th November 2016*, Seville, Spain, pp. 8148 – 8153.
- Leavitt, M. (2017). *Your passport to Gifted Education*. USA: Springer.
- Matsueda, R. L. (2014). The Natural History of Labelling Theory. In D. P. Farrington, J. Murray (eds.). *Labelling Theory: Empirical Tests*. New Brunswick and London: Transaction Publishers, pp. 13 – 44.
- Matthews, M. S., Ritchotte, J. A. & Jolly, J. L. (2014). What’s wrong with giftedness? Parents’ perceptions of the gifted label. *International Studies in Sociology of Education*, 24, issue 4, pp. 372 – 393.
- McCoach, D. B. & Siegle, D. (2007). What Predicts Teachers’ Attitudes Toward the Gifted? *The Gifted Child Quarterly*, 51, issue 3, pp. 246 – 255.
- MSMT (2014). *Giftedness strategy*. Retrieved from: <http://www.msmt.cz/areas-of-work/sport-and-youth/giftedness-strategy-2020?highlightWords=gifted> (Accessed on 10.3.2020).
- NUV (2018). *Standard komplexní diagnostiky mimořádného (intelektového) nadání*. Retrieved from: http://www.nuv.cz/uploads/rovne_prilezitosti_ve_vzdelavani/nadani/diagnostika/standard_diagnostiky_mn_2018_12_06.pdf (Accessed on 10.3.2020).
- Olszewski-Kubilius, P., Lee, S.Y. & Thomson, D. (2014). Family Environment and Social Development in Gifted Students. *Gifted Child Quarterly*, 58, issue 3, pp. 199-216.
- Pfeiffer, S. I. (2015). *Essentials of Gifted Assessment*. New Jersey: John Wiley & sons.
- Portešová, Š., Budíková, M., & Juhová, D. (2014). Myths about Gifted Learners from the Perspective of Teachers. *The New Educational review*, 37, issue 3, pp 229 – 242.
- Robinson, A. (1990). Does That Describe Me? Adolescents’ Acceptance of the Gifted Label. *Journal for the Education of the Gifted*, 13, issue 3, pp. 245 – 255.
- Schilling, S. R., Sparfeldt, J. R. and Rost, D. H. (2006). Families with Gifted Adolescents. *Educational Psychology*, 26, issue 1, pp. 19-32.

Tomlinson, C. A. (2013). Differentiated Instruction. In C. M. Callahan & H. L. Herberg-Davis (eds.). *Fundamentals of Gifted Education, Considering Multiple Perspectives*. New York and London: Routledge, pp. 287-300.

Treffinger, D. J. (2009). Demythologizing Gifted Education. *Gifted Child Quarterly*, 53, issue 4, pp. 229 – 232.

VUP (2007). *Framework Education Programme for Elementary Education*. Retrieved from: http://www.vuppraha.rvp.cz/wp-content/uploads/2009/12/RVP_ZV_EN_final.pdf (Accessed on 10.3.2020).

Wirthwein, L, Bergold, S., Preckel F. & Steinmayr, R. (2019). Personality and school functioning of intellectually gifted and nongifted adolescents: Self-perceptions and parents' assessments. *Learning and Individual Differences*, 73, pp. 16-29.

Yildiz, A. Baltaci, S. & Aytakin, C. (2019). A Comparison of Parents of Gifted Students and Non-Gifted Students: A Case of Expectations from Mathematics Education. *Cukurova University Faculty of Education Journal*, 48, issue 1, pp. 452-497.

Zakreski, M. J. (2018). When Emotional Intensity and Cognitive Rigidity Collide: What Can Counselors and Teachers Do? *Gifted Child Today*, 41, issue 4, pp. 208-216.

Ziegler, A. & Stoeger, H. (2010). Research on a modified framework of implicit personality theories. *Learning and Individual Differences: Journal of Psychology and Education*, 20, issue 4, pp. 318–326.