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ABSTRACT: The present study, with a quali-quantitative approach, described the profile of students with high abilities/giftedness (AH/SD). Eleven students, ten parents and seven teachers participated in it. The following instruments were used: List of items for observation in the classroom; Raven's test; WISC-III; School Performance Test (TDE); School grades; Scale for Assessing Behavioral Characteristics of Students with Higher Abilities (SRBCSS) and Checklist of Characteristics Associated with Giftedness (CCAS). Among the instruments, the List of items for observation in the classroom, answered by the teachers, shows the most important tool in the identification of signs of AH/SD. Academic performance was shown to be high in school grades, but they were not confirmed in the TDE. Parents were able to observe many AH/SD characteristics in their children in the CCAS and, in the SRBCSS, teachers identified more characteristics of creativity, motivation and leadership. Of the established criteria, 63% of the students reached seven of them. The importance of multimodal assessment is emphasized, as when defining the profile of these students, their greatest skills and difficulties can be found, providing a teaching that is more suited to their needs.


RESUMO: O presente estudo, de abordagem quali-quantitativa, descreveu o perfil de alunos com altas habilidades/superdotação (AH/SD). Participaram dele onze alunos, dez pais e sete professores. Foram utilizados como instrumentos: Lista de itens para observação em sala de aula; Teste de Raven; WISC-III; Teste de Desempenho Escolar (TDE); Notas escolares; Escala para Avaliação das Características Comportamentais dos Alunos com Habilidades Superiores (SRBCSS) e Checklist de Características Associadas à Superdotação (CCAS). Dentre os instrumentos, a Lista de itens para observação em sala de aula, respondida pelos professores, mostrou-se a ferramenta mais importante na identificação de sinais de AH/SD. O desempenho acadêmico se mostrou alto nas notas escolares, mas não foi confirmado no TDE. Os pais conseguiram observar muitas características de AH/SD em seus filhos na CCAS e, os professores, na SRBCSS, identificaram mais características de criatividade, motivação e liderança. Dos critérios estabelecidos, 63% dos alunos alcançaram sete deles. Ressalta-se a importância da avaliação multimodal, pois ao definir o perfil desses alunos, pode-se encontrar suas maiores habilidades e dificuldades, propiciando um ensino mais adequado às suas necessidades.


RESUMEN: El presente estudio, con un enfoque cuali-cuantitativo, describió el perfil de los estudiantes con altas habilidades/superdotação (AH/SD). En ella participaron once alumnos, diez padres y siete docentes. Se utilizaron los siguientes instrumentos: Lista de ítems para la observación en el aula; prueba de Raven; WISC-III; Teste de Desempeño Escolar (TDE); Notas escolares; Escala para la Evaluación de las Características Conductuales de los Alumnos con Habilidades Superiores (SRBCSS) y Lista de Verificación de Características Asociadas a la Superdotación (CCAS). Entre los instrumentos, la Lista de ítems para observación en el aula, respondida por los docentes, se mostró como la herramienta más importante en la identificación de signos de AH/SD. El rendimiento académico se mostró alto en los grados escolares, pero no fueron confirmados en el TDE. Los padres pudieron observar muchas características AH/SD en sus hijos en el CCAS y, en el SRBCSS, los maestros identificaron más características de creatividad, motivación y liderazgo. De los criterios establecidos, el 63% de los estudiantes cumplieron con siete de ellos. Se destaca la importancia de la evaluación multimodal, ya que a la hora de definir el perfil de estos alumnos se pueden encontrar sus mayores capacidades y dificultades, proporcionando una enseñanza más adecuada a sus necesidades.

Introduction

The definition of high abilities/giftedness (AH/SD) has been a very challenging activity. For Renzulli (2005, 2011, 2016), regardless of the area, AH/SD consist of the interaction of three basic aspects of human functioning: above-average general or specific skills, a high level of commitment to the task and a high level of creativity.

While general skills consider logical, abstract reasoning and previous experiences for the quick and adequate solution of problems or adaptations to new situations (PASSOS; BARBOSA, 2011), specific skills refer to the ability to acquire knowledge, define strategies and execute appropriately and, at a high level, an activity. Task involvement and creativity are present in both cases, more frequently in specific skills, which are the person's focus of interest.

When the specific area has already been identified, it is possible to assess how much involvement there is in the task, as well as the creative aspects involved in it. However, when the ability is general, identifying creativity and involvement in the task is a challenge. In the first case, of specific skills, even if there is a genetic potential for high performance, the environment plays an important role in offering opportunities for the person to experiment and, later, adequately develop their potential through involvement with the task, experiencing the results of their creative processes (RENZULLI, 1986, 1998).

Such skills can, considering opportunities, be identified at any stage of life. The diversity of experiences would help the early identification of these skills. On the other hand, general skills can be detected early from observations, in the course of development, of behaviors beyond that expected for chronological age, with emphasis on solving everyday problems, curiosity and active search for knowledge (RENZULLI, 1986, 1998). Both general and specific skills can be observed by parents, educators, peers and the person themselves and subsequently confirmed by specific assessments.

Considering the multiplicity of aspects involved, the literature in the area has recommended that the evaluation process for the diagnosis of AH/SD use information from different measurements, using various means for identification, in order to make it more appropriate and complete, thus being able to identify a greater number of characteristics of the individual (DAVIS; RIMM; SIEGLE, 2011; FLEITH, 2007; GUENTHER, 2000; MILLIGAN, 2010; NAKANO et al., 2015; NAKANO; CAMPOS; SANTOS, 2016; POCINHO, 2009; RIBEIRO, 2013; SILVA; METTRAU, 2010; VIRGOLIM, 2007). This information will also serve to identify areas of interest, their strongest points and to consider the specialized service that will be offered (PFEIFFER; BLEI, 2008).
Nakano, Campos and Santos (2016) and Nakano et al. (2015) draw attention to the lack of an assessment protocol for AH/SD that is endorsed by the Federal Council of Psychology (CFP). There is also no evaluation protocol suggested by the Ministry of Education (MEC) or the Department of Education of the State of São Paulo, the place where this study was carried out and which is considered a reference in terms of research and legislation in the country, for the evaluation of this study population, when identified by school professionals or even upon parental demand. The result is the lack of clear criteria, established based on appropriate measures for evaluating people with AH/SD. As a consequence, it is possible to find mistaken diagnoses, both positive and negative, which can determine erroneous development courses, especially when it comes to children (EKLUND et al., 2015). However, with the emergence or expansion of specialized services in Education systems, it is possible that, in the near future, such measures will be effectively taken.

As instruments to evaluate intellectual performance, studies in the area point to the Wechsler Intelligence Scale for Children (WISC), which today in Brazil is already in its fourth edition (MANI, 2015; MENDONÇA; RODRIGUES; CAPELLINI, 2018; VEIGA, 2014; VIRGOLIM, 2014), and the Raven Progressive Matrices test (BARBOSA, 2014; GONÇALVES, 2010; MENDONÇA; RODRIGUES; CAPELLINI, 2017; PASSOS; BARBOSA, 2011; SILVA, 2013; VIRGOLIM, 2014). There are also instruments that separately assess the constructs associated with intellectual performance, such as logical, numerical and abstract reasoning (NAKANO et al., 2015; NAKANO; PRIMI, 2012; PASSOS; BARBOSA, 2011; PRIMI et al., 2013).

According to Pocinho (2009), among the most used psychometric tests to identify HA/SD are the Wechsler scales, followed by the Stanford-Binet Intelligence Scale and the Raven test. These tests, in addition to providing evidence of validity, serve as screening for the identification of HA/SD (SILVA; ROLIM; MAZOLI, 2016).

In relation to academic performance, the School Performance Test (TDE) has been widely used, as it assesses fundamental abilities related to reading, writing and arithmetic, showing the school areas of greater or lesser ability of the student (STEIN, 1994). It was applied in the Attention Program for Precocious Students with Indicators of High Skills (PAPAHS) (PEDRO; PALUDO; CHACON, 2013) and by Mendonça, Rodrigues and Capellini (2017). In addition to school performance assessed by a standardized instrument, some authors used students' school grades (FONSECA, 2010; MENDONÇA; RODRIGUES; CAPELLINI, 2017).

To identify specific areas, researchers have used the Scale for Assessment of Behavioral Characteristics of Students with Higher Abilities – Revised Edition (SRBCSS-R) (RENZULLI et al., 2002, translated by VIRGOLIM, 2005) and the List of items for classroom observation, identification protocol, developed by Guenther (1998). The SRBCSS-R is answered by teachers, to identify areas of interest or emphasis for children and adolescents (FONSECA, 2010; GUENTHER, 2000; PASSOS; BARBOSA, 2011; VIRGOLIM, 2014). And, the List of items for observation in the classroom, identification protocol, teachers fill out, noting the students who stand out most in the items presented in the instrument, providing the areas of mastery of each child (BARBOSA, 2014; MENDONÇA; RODRIGUES; CAPELLINI, 2017; SOARES, 2019). In the studies cited, teachers are considered good informants about the characteristics of students with AH/SD, as children spend most of the day at school and, in this classroom context, teachers are able to more easily perceive the skills academics expressed by them. Therefore, the importance of the teacher being well trained to evaluate the diversity of characteristics present in people with AH/SD is highlighted (PEDRO; CHACON, 2015; SOARES, 2019), considering that he is one of the main informants of the singularities of students in the identification process. However, it is also worth highlighting that despite this, the teacher is not the only one responsible for the assessment and diagnosis, whether of HA/SD or any disorder or disability.

The Checklist of Characteristics Associated with Giftedness (CCAS) (SMUTNY, 2001, translated and adapted by BARBOSA et al., 2008) is an instrument that has been used by different researchers to investigate child development, from the parents' point of view. (CUNHA, 2018; GUENTHER, 2000; PASSOS; BARBOSA, 2011; SOARES, 2019). Parents are important informants, considering that they live with the child on a daily basis, meeting their basic needs and, also, because AH/SD appear early in the course of development and can draw their attention when they compare their children with other children of the same age (OLIVEIRA, 2014; SAKAGUTI; BOLSANELLO, 2012).

Given that creativity is one of the factors present in people with AH/SD, several researchers have been concerned with developing instruments to assess it (FLEITH, 2016; GONÇALVES, 2010; MILIANI; NAKANO, 2013; NAKANO et al., 2015; NAKANO; PRIMI, 2012; PASSOS; BARBOSA, 2011; POÇINHO, 2009; PRIMI et al., 2013; VIRGOLIM, 2014). Among the most used tests are: the Torrance Creativity Test (NAKANO; PRIMI, 2012;
OGURLU; YALIN; BIRBEN, 2018); the Children's Figural Creativity Test (NAKANO; PRIMI, 2012) and the Climate for Creativity in the Classroom Scale (FLEITH, 2010, 2016). However, as it is directly associated with the human activity in which the person stands out, it is difficult to find instruments that evaluate all areas.

The diversity of the instruments used is due to the theoretical approach that supports the vision of intelligence and giftedness and the intense search for suitable material to map the many skills present in the repertoire of people with AH/SD. The concern with assessment can be attributed to what the literature in the area has pointed out as the variability of characteristics that can be found in these people (CUPERTINO, 2008; FLEITH, 2007; GUENTHER, 2000; VIRGOLIM, 2007). Such characteristics grouped here may be present (or not) in the behavioral repertoire of these people, making it possible to even define their area of giftedness, such as different talents in science, sport, music, leadership of people, among the extensive list of human activities.

Among the characteristics of AH/SD described in the studies are: exceptional knowledge in one or more areas of activity or knowledge (RENZULLI, 1998; SERRA, 2005); good memory and retention of information quickly (BHARAJ, 2013; BRASIL, 2006; FLEITH, 2006; SERRA, 2005; WEBB, 1994); versatility in many skills (FLEITH, 2006; WEBB, 1994); rapid learning (FLEITH, 2006); advanced vocabulary for their chronological age (FLEITH, 2006; SERRA, 2005; STAMBAUGH; FORD, 2015; UGRAS; SEN; CIL, 2015; WEBB, 1994); richness of verbal expression, elaboration and fluency of ideas (FLEITH, 2006); ability to deal with abstract ideas (ALENCAR; FLEITH, 2001; BRASIL, 2006; FLEITH, 2006; SERRA, 2005); ability to perceive discrepancies between ideas and points of view (FLEITH, 2006); organizes things and people (WEBB, 1994); large amount of information on different topics (ALENCAR; FLEITH, 2001); reading and writing skills at a young age (ALENCAR; FLEITH, 2001; UGRAS; SEN; CIL, 2015); preference for complex ideas (ALENCAR; FLEITH, 2001); tendency to spend time productively (ALENCAR; FLEITH, 2001); presents flexibility and fluency of thought (BRASIL, 2006), and ability to evaluate, synthesize and organize knowledge (BRASIL, 2006).

However, despite all these characteristics being the main and most commonly found in people with AH/SD, Fernandes, Mamede and Sousa (2004, p. 52, our translation) recall that “[...] it is impossible to present a list of characteristics that encompass all possible and existing ones, since the areas of giftedness are very diverse and, even within each of these areas, not all children have the same characteristics”. 
Thus, it must be “considered that not all gifted people have the same characteristics” (SABATELLA, 2008, p. 84, our translation) or traits, like any other person. Therefore, there must be a variety of means both to identify and meet their educational needs, not assuming that all students with AH/SD present all these characteristics and, when they do, they do not necessarily occur simultaneously and at the same level (BRASIL, 2006). Students may have significant performance in some areas, medium or low in others, depending on how they express their potential and the environment in which they are inserted. Therefore, due to the diversity of characteristics of this population, we found the complexity of identifying them, as their activities encompass cognitive, social and emotional variables (SILVA; ROLIM; MAZOLI, 2016).

The description of the profile of students identified with AH/SD, obtained from an assessment involving several instruments that result in an expressive set of information, allows us to know and make decisions regarding what to offer them to contribute to the development of their skills. Therefore, the objective of this study was to describe the profile of students identified with AH/SD, considering teachers' recommendations, intellectual and academic performance, behavioral characteristics from the point of view of parents and teachers, and school grades for the year in which they were enrolled were collected.

**Method**

The present study originated from the project entitled “Identification of students with high abilities/giftedness based on a multimodal assessment”, which was approved by the Research Ethics Committee (CEP), under Certificate of Presentation for Ethical Appreciation (CAAE) no. 20046813.2.0000.5398. Ethical precepts were complied with, such as the signing of the Free and Informed Consent Form by parents and teachers and the Free and Informed Assent Form by the children.

Eleven students participated in this study, seven boys and four girls, aged between seven and nine years old. As for the school year they attended, one was in the 1st year, three in the 2nd, one in the 3rd and six in the 4th year. They all attended a state school, located in a suburban neighborhood in a city in the interior of the state of São Paulo. In addition to the students, ten parents responsible for the children participated, as one refused to participate, and seven teachers, as three had more than one student with AH/SD in their classroom. Data collection took place in 2014.
The students participating in this research were identified with AH/SD from a list of 259 students from an elementary school, in a project where all students were evaluated (MENDONÇA; RODRIGUES; CAPELLINI, 2017, 2018).

To evaluate the students' intellectual performance, the Raven 's Colored Progressive Matrices Test (Special Scale) and the Wechsler Intelligence Scale for Children (WISC-III) were used. The Raven is intended to evaluate the intellectual processes of children aged 5 to 11 years. It consists of a set of boards located at the top of the page, with one piece missing. At the bottom, there are four to six design possibilities that complete it. Once chosen, the child must write down the letter of the corresponding piece on the protocol. One point is assigned for each correct answer, which must subsequently be transformed into a percentile, according to the table proposed in the manual, thus obtaining the classification (ANGELINI et al., 1999). The WISC-III aims to assess the intellectual capacity of children aged between 6 and 16 years. This instrument consists of a group of 12 subtests, which are divided into verbal and execution scales. From the evaluation of this instrument, three outcome measures are obtained: verbal IQ, execution IQ and total IQ (WECHSLER, 2002). In 2013, the WISC-IV was translated into Brazil, subsequent to this collection.

To evaluate academic performance, the School Performance Test (TDE) and school grades were used. The TDE is a psychometric instrument that assesses fundamental abilities for school performance, based on three subtests: writing, arithmetic and reading. This test was developed based on the Brazilian reality and is used with students from the 1st to 6th grade of Elementary School (currently 2nd to 7th year). The test proposes three classifications: superior (S), medium (M) and inferior (I) (STEIN, 1994). This instrument had its second edition published in 2019, also after data collection from this research. To analyze school grades, bimonthly grades were used for each subject studied by students throughout the school year, obtained from the school secretariat's records.

The students' behavioral characteristics were assessed with the List of Items for Classroom Observation, the Scale for Assessing Behavioral Characteristics of Students with Higher Abilities – Revised Edition (SRBCSS-R) and the Checklist of Characteristics Associated with Giftedness (CCAS). The List of Items for Observation in the Classroom was used to identify, together with teachers, students who they judged to be performing above average. The instrument consists of 25 items that describe characteristics associated with areas of giftedness. The teacher should fill out a questionnaire for each classroom, indicating the students who stood out most in each of the items (GUENTHER, 1998). The SRBCSS-R is an
instrument composed of thirteen characteristics: learning, creativity, motivation, leadership, communication, planning, artistic, musical, dramatic, in relation to science, technology, mathematics and reading. The teacher should mark how often each characteristic was observed, which could be: Not Observed (NO), Never (N), Rarely (R), Sometimes (AV) and Always (S). Each of the characteristics has a score, totaling 504 points (RENZULLI et al., 2002, translated by VIRGOLIM, 2005). CCAS is a translated and adapted version of Stand up for your gifted child (SMUTNY, 2001 apud BARBOSA et al., 2008). The instrument contains 42 statements about the characteristics of people with AH/SD, with only two alternatives: yes or no, which must be completed by the parents.

The WISC-III was administered individually, at a previously scheduled time, in two sessions of approximately 45 minutes each. The TDE was applied individually, with an average duration of 20 minutes. Raven was applied in small groups, which varied depending on student availability, with an average duration of 20 minutes. All tests were administered over the course of a week, one per day, always during class time, in a room reserved at the school for carrying out these tests. Teachers and parents were instructed individually to fill out the questionnaires, and the teachers took the protocols for later completion.

The WISC-III and TDE were corrected and interpreted in accordance with the standards of their respective manuals. From the List of items for observation in the classroom, the students indicated by their teachers were identified, as proposed by the instrument, and the characteristics highlighted by the teachers were listed. The SRBCSS was described and organized according to the characteristics observed by teachers for each student. To analyze the characteristics, a minimum value of up to 90% of the total points for each skill was arbitrarily established for this study, to consider that they were identified by the teacher. The CCAS, answered by parents, was described and organized according to the characteristics presented by their children. Assuming that all statements refer to behaviors present in children with AH/SD, the higher the child's score, the more behaviors related to giftedness they present, the indicator of 70% was arbitrarily established for analysis or more of behaviors referred to by parents as present. The grades were presented in relation to the average performance obtained in each two months of the year, considering the criterion of 8.5 average.
Results and discussion

Table 1 describes the results obtained in all assessments carried out. In total, 12 assessments were carried out, considering: 90th percentile or more on Raven; superior performance in the TDE subtests (writing, arithmetic, reading and total); IQ of 120 or more on the WISC-III (verbal, execution, and total); professor's recommendation in at least one area; description of at least one characteristic by the teacher in the SRBCSS; score above 70% on the CCAS and final average above 8.5.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student</th>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Percentile in Raven</th>
<th>TDE performance</th>
<th>IQ WISC</th>
<th>Indication areas</th>
<th>Number of characteristics in SRBCSS</th>
<th>CCAS percentile</th>
<th>School grade average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A01</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>7a</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>M M M I</td>
<td>120 132 128</td>
<td>Abstract thinking</td>
<td>06</td>
<td>71.43</td>
<td>8.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A02</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>7a</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>I s s M</td>
<td>144 128 139</td>
<td>All the areas</td>
<td>07</td>
<td>71.43</td>
<td>9.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A03</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>7a</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>M I M M</td>
<td>117 137 130</td>
<td>Abstract thinking</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>83.33</td>
<td>8.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A04</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>7a to 8m</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>I M s M</td>
<td>131 132 134</td>
<td>Abstract thinking</td>
<td>06</td>
<td>80.95</td>
<td>9.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A05</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>9a</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>M M s s</td>
<td>118 128 125</td>
<td>Abstract thinking</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>73.81</td>
<td>9.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A06</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>9a</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>I M s I</td>
<td>135 141 141</td>
<td>Abstract thinking</td>
<td>06</td>
<td>57.14</td>
<td>8.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A07</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>9a</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>M I M I</td>
<td>133 100 118</td>
<td>Verbal talent</td>
<td>01</td>
<td>54.76</td>
<td>7.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A08</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>9a</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>s I s M</td>
<td>135 123 132</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>08</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A09</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>9a</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>s I s M</td>
<td>128 111 122</td>
<td>Verbal talent and Abstract thinking</td>
<td>05</td>
<td>61.90</td>
<td>8.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A10</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>9a</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>M I M I</td>
<td>130 106 121</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>01</td>
<td>80.95</td>
<td>8.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A11</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>9a</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>I I I I</td>
<td>131 135 135</td>
<td>Creativity</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>78.57</td>
<td>7.78</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Prepared by the authors

Student A01 presented eight of the established criteria, with low performance in the four TDE subtests. Student A02 presented nine of the criteria, not achieving what was expected in the Raven and in two TDE subtests. A03 obtained six of the expected criteria, failing to reach the TDE subtests, the verbal IQ of the WISC-III, and did not have any relevant area described by the teacher in the SRBCSS. A04 obtained nine of the criteria, failing to meet them in three of the TDE subtests. A05 obtained eight of the criteria with performance below expectations in two subtests of the TDE, in the Verbal IQ of the WISC-III, and did not have sufficient indication in any area of the SRBCSS. A06 obtained eight of the criteria, presenting low performance in three of the TDE subtests and in the parents' report. A07 presented three of the criteria, being
above expected in verbal IQ and in the two teacher indications. A08 obtained seven of the criteria, but was not indicated by the teacher during classroom observation and was not evaluated by his parents. A09 obtained eight criteria, showing low performance in one of the TDE subtests and in the parents' report. A10 presented five criteria, with superior performance in verbal IQ and parental report and no indication from the teacher. A11 obtained five criteria, presenting a verbal and execution IQ above the stipulated level, but did not achieve what was expected in the Raven and in three subtests of the TDE.

This study aimed to describe the profile of students confirmed with AH/SD, considering teachers' recommendations, intellectual performance, academic performance, behavioral characteristics from the point of view of parents and teachers and school grades obtained in the year in which the remaining data were collected.

Students A02 and A04 met nine of the 12 established criteria. It is observed that non-compliance with two of them refers to performance in the TDE, which probably indicates a teaching problem. The low performance on Raven in A02 may be due to a failure to understand the examples, considering the student's young age (7 years old).

Students A01, A05, A06 and A09 met eight of the expected criteria, all of which were below in at least half of the TDE subtests and two in the parents' report. Low performance on the TDE is seen as a schooling problem, while non-identification by parents may be due to their low level of education, as already pointed out by Oliveira (2007), Renzulli (1998, 2016) and Smutny (2000). A08 met seven of the criteria, not being evaluated by his parents. Of the other assessments, it was below expectations in two of the TDE subtests, it was not indicated by the teacher, who subsequently indicated eight skills in the SRBCSS, and also presented a lower score. Freeman and Guenther (2000) highlighted the existence of discrepancies in teacher judgment regarding students with AH/SD, claiming that teachers deal with giftedness as if it were a universal attribute, based on fixed and immutable characteristics, in addition to perceiving them as having immense capacity for logical reasoning, quick understanding, and intellectual curiosity, in combination with good grades at school.

A03 presented half of the expected criteria with performance below in all subtests of the TDE, in verbal IQ of the WISC and none of the characteristics in the SRBCSS. Two students, A10 and A11, exhibited five of the expected criteria, with low performance in the four TDE subtests and in the grade average. A10 was not indicated by the teacher and A11 did not have any characteristics in the SRBCSS. A07 met three of the criteria: verbal IQ above expected and
two indications from the teacher, one in the list of items for observation in the classroom and the other in the SRBCSS, appearing to be a case of verbal talent.

It is observed that there was coherence between the Raven and WISC results for the assessment of intellectual performance. Of the students who had a 90th percentile or more on the Raven, they also had at least two IQs above 120. Such data reinforce the use of these instruments to identify AH/SD present in recent studies (MANI, 2015; MENDONÇA; RODRIGUES; CAPELLINI, 2018; SILVA, 2013; SILVA; ROLIM; MAZOLI, 2016; VEIGA, 2014; VIRGOLIM, 2014).

The results obtained in the TDE to evaluate school performance pointed to a situation that represents the Brazilian educational reality: the school does not teach even the minimum expected for the school grade/year. However, the social, economic and cultural context of the community where the school is located must be considered as an influencer on these results.

Of the results obtained by the group of students, in one third of the subtests it was lower than expected for the school year. From the established criterion, superior performance in the TDE, in only 10 of the 44 subtests analyzed did the result exceed the adopted criterion. Marturano, Toller and Elias (2005) found in their study that 96% of the sample of children had intellectual capacity within normal limits, through evaluation with the Raven's test, however, in the TDE, 89% of the participants had lower academic performance than expected for their school year, showing that the children had cognitive potential for learning, but had low academic performance. In this case, the authors suggested the existence of other variables that could have interfered with the academic performance of these students, such as: anxiety, depression and behavioral problems. These are factors that may be closely related to the social and cultural aspects of the population.

It is noteworthy that, in the same way, we must consider that there are gifted underachievers, people who have high cognitive potential and low academic performance (TENTES; FLEITH; ALMEIDA, 2016). However, to be considered gifted underachiever, there are four factors that must be considered: exhibiting high cognitive potential on standardized tests; demonstrate low academic performance, that is, performance incompatible with revealed potential and lower academic performance; presenting a school trajectory below expectations for curricular advancement, year/grade, and also being described by their teachers and mentors as gifted with low academic performance (OUROFINO; FLEITH, 2011). These factors were not found in our students, as in general, they presented school grades within the average, indicating that teachers did not observe lower academic performance in these students. But also,
only three of them had an average above nine. When comparing the school grades of gifted and non-gifted students, Gonçalves (2010) observed that the school averages of those considered gifted were relatively higher than those of the other group.

Considering the teachers’ assessment, coherence was observed for six of the students, in which the teacher indicates and points out characteristics. For the others, either they did not indicate and then described characteristics or they indicated and did not present characteristics. Soares (2019) points to the need for teacher training to identify and evaluate students with AH/SD before filling out any instrument, a fact that did not occur in our study and that possibly prevented the teacher from taking a more appropriate look at the issue to this population. However, we emphasize the importance of the teacher being a good observer of the students' characteristics, but the referendum must take place by a multidisciplinary team, specialized in the area, with psychologists, pedagogues and psychopedagogues, of which the teacher must be part.

Of the parents, one did not respond. Of the 10 who did so, 70% observed characteristics of giftedness in their children, which points to good informants. Smutny (2000), in his study, found that around 80% of parents were able to identify characteristics of AH/SD in their children aged between four and five years, a rate close to that observed in our study. One hypothesis is that parents of younger children spend more time with them, interacting and observing them. In the present study, the children were older (between seven and ten years old), which may explain the fact that parents did not observe many AH/SD characteristics in their children when filling out the CCAS. According to Oliveira (2007), despite parents having information that cannot be obtained through standardized tests or even information from the school, this type of appointment is still little used, as many parents are afraid that their child will be different and may have problems with labeling. Therefore, it is important that parents receive guidance on what AH/SD means, what the main characteristics are and why this identification is important. Furthermore, they need to be guided while filling out the instrument, clarifying any doubts they may have, thus minimizing possible errors in identification.

Regarding performance on the TDE, five of the students did not reach the defined criteria. Of them, all had at least one inferior result. Four of them had two superior results. Of the assessments foreseen in the TDE, 22.7% of the results were lower than expected for the year. Therefore, the results in the TDE, which assesses the academic performance expected for the year, did not confirm the superior performance, with the worst results being in arithmetic. Such results point to serious teaching problems at school.
The analysis of the data obtained in this study confirms the importance of multiple assessments for identifying people with AH/SD, as different studies in the area have pointed out (DAVIS; RIMM; SIEGLE, 2011; GONÇALVES, 2010; MILLIGAN, 2010; NAKANO et al., 2015; NAKANO; CAMPOS; SANTOS, 2016; PEREIRA, 2010; POCINHO, 2009; RIBEIRO, 2013; SILVA; METTRAU, 2010).

Final remarks

The present study intended to describe the profile of students identified with AH/SD, considering teachers' recommendations, intellectual and academic performance, behavioral characteristics from the point of view of parents and teachers and school grades for the year in which the other data were collected. It was possible to confirm the importance of multiple assessments, already highlighted in other studies.

By defining the profile of students with AH/SD, it is possible to find the most frequent skills and difficulties they present, so that teaching can be provided that is appropriate to their needs. Another point was to identify, in the instruments used, the strengths and weaknesses of each one, avoiding future errors and achieving a more accurate identification of students with AH/SD.

One of the limitations of this study was the fact that it did not use instruments that more specifically assess creativity and motivation in tasks, which are characteristics considered essential in people with AH/SD, as well as other attributes described in the literature, such as social characteristics, emotional, leadership, among others. Finally, as already described, there are many characteristics observed in individuals with AH/SD and, therefore, it would not be possible to identify them all in a single study. However, the importance of establishing a protocol for identifying this population, as well as its characteristics, is highlighted again, to better understand these learners, already in the early years of Elementary School, in order to promote their academic, cognitive and social development, at school and beyond.

As contributions of this research, it is highlighted that, based on its results, the first resource room was created, in the state of São Paulo, for specific assistance to students with AH/SD, promoted by the state Department of Education and, based on the described profile of the participants, it was possible to outline activities and strategies aimed at each of these students, in order to promote the development of their skills, whether at school or in other contexts of their daily life.
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