

RIGHTS OF THE GIFTED PERSON: RECOGNITION, GUARANTEE, AND CHALLENGES IN THE CONSTRUCTION OF AN INCLUSIVE SOCIETY

 <https://doi.org/10.56238/arev7n3-232>

Submitted on: 02/23/2025

Publication date: 03/23/2025

Álaze Gabriel do Breviário¹, Leliane Aparecida Castro Rocha², Elaine Cristina Batista Borges de Oliveira³, Deusirene Souza da Silva Fróes⁴, Adriano César Jerônimo da Costa⁵, João Batista Lucena⁶, Logan Faedda Rago⁷ and Adriana Tavares Gomes de Araújo⁸

ABSTRACT

This research investigated the intersection between giftedness, cognitive development, and educational inclusion in the light of the Giftedean neoperspectivist paradigm, which

¹ Master of Theology

Master's student in Educational Sciences and Christian Ethics

Ivy Enber Christian University (IECU)

Orlando, Florida, United States

Lattes URL: <http://lattes.cnpq.br/9973998907456283>

² PhD in Education

Methodist University of São Paulo (UMESP)

São Paulo, SP, Brazil

Email: prof.lelianerocha@gmail.com

Lattes URL: <http://lattes.cnpq.br/6176059915115617>

³ PhD in Education

Methodist University of São Paulo (UMESP)

São Paulo, SP, Brazil

Email: ecbbo@yahoo.com.br

Lattes: <http://lattes.cnpq.br/3155234667857480>

⁴ PhD student in Educational Sciences and Christian Ethics

Ivy Enber Christian University, IECU

Orlando, Florida, United States

Email: deusirenesouzasilvafroes@gmail.com

Lattes URL: <https://lattes.cnpq.br/0218139923264576>

⁵ PhD student in Educational Sciences and Christian Ethics

Ivy Enber Christian University, IECU

Orlando, Florida, United States

Email: adrianocjc@gmail.com

Lattes URL: <http://lattes.cnpq.br/9943333676982530>.

⁶ Master's Degree in Education

Federal Institute of Education, Science and Technology of Rio Grande do Norte, IFRN

Natal, Rio Grande do Norte, Brazil

Email: joao.batista.lucena@gmail.com

Lattes URL: <http://lattes.cnpq.br/2822567703207399>

⁷ Master's student in Educational Sciences and Christian Ethics

Ivy Enber Christian University, IECU

Orlando, Florida, United States

Email: loganfaedda@hotmail.com

Lattes URL: <https://lattes.cnpq.br/2516880221903287>

⁸ Specialist in Environmental Management. Biologist

Federal University of Rio Grande do Norte (UFRN)

Email: adry0704@gmail.com

Lattes URL: <http://lattes.cnpq.br/3538361818689436>

considers the coexistence of absolute and relative truths, as well as self-management and the promotion of justice and diversity. The study contextualizes the need for more comprehensive models for the identification and development of high skills, highlighting theoretical and practical challenges in the current literature. The central problem lies in the insufficiency of integrative approaches that contemplate the multiple dimensions of giftedness. The main objective was to analyze the applicability of the Giftedean neoperspectivist paradigm in the understanding and promotion of high cognitive potential. Methodologically, the research adopted the hypothetical-deductive method, based on theories such as the Theory of Multiple Intelligences, the Triarchic Theory of Intelligence and the Theory of Positive Disintegration. A Bibliographic and Documentary Narrative Review was carried out, consulting databases such as Scopus, Web of Science and SciELO, analyzing 127 high-impact articles. The findings revealed that giftedness must be understood in a multidimensional way and that inclusive approaches are essential. Gaps were identified in the literature regarding longitudinal and comparative studies between different sociocultural contexts. Limitations include the absence of primary data and reliance on secondary sources. It contributes theoretically by broadening the discussion on human potential, methodologically by exemplifying the application of the hypothetical-deductive method and empirically by suggesting guidelines for more effective educational policies. The study adds value to science, graduate studies, and the formulation of inclusive strategies in education.

Keywords: Advanced cognition. Interpretative models. Multidimensional approach. Human potential. Differentiated inclusion.

INTRODUCTION

Giftedness has been the subject of growing academic and scientific interest, especially about its impacts on cognitive and socio-emotional development. According to Renzulli (2012), giftedness can be understood as a multifaceted phenomenon that involves above-average skills, involvement with the task and creativity. Recent studies reinforce the complexity of this topic, showing that there are different profiles of gifted people, ranging from those with high specific abilities to others with exceptional performance in various areas of knowledge (Pfeiffer, 2015). The traditional perspective of giftedness has been widely revised, especially in the light of new paradigms, such as Giftedean neoperspectivism, which considers contextual and dynamic elements in the development of human potential (Freeman, 2018). The need to broaden the understanding of this phenomenon justifies the present research, which is part of the interdisciplinary field of Education, Psychology and Neurosciences.

In the contemporary context, the understanding of giftedness has expanded beyond classical psychometric models, encompassing social, emotional, and educational dimensions. The literature highlights the relevance of more comprehensive theoretical models, such as Renzulli's Three Rings Theory (2012) and Sternberg's (2020) approach to successful intelligence, which emphasizes the interplay between analytical, creative, and practical skills. In Brazil, recent research demonstrates the lack of effective public policies to identify and serve gifted students in basic education (Fleith et al., 2021). At the same time, neuroscience has contributed significantly to the understanding of brain plasticity and differentiated cognitive characteristics of gifted people (Karwowski et al., 2020). The adoption of more flexible and inclusive models has been advocated in the international literature, as evidenced by studies that discuss the need for adaptive educational approaches and curriculum enrichment (Subotnik; Olszewski-Kubilius; Worrell, 2016).

In view of this panorama, the following problem emerges: how can the Theory of Predestination, allied to the Giftedean neo-perspectivist paradigm, contribute to a new understanding of giftedness and to the formulation of more effective educational strategies? The gap in the literature on the intersection between these concepts reinforces the relevance of this investigation. Recent studies suggest that traditional models of giftedness identification can be limited and exclusionary, especially about underrepresented populations (McBee; Peters; Waterman, 2019). Thus, it is questioned

whether a new paradigm could provide more robust subsidies for the understanding and care of these individuals.

The justification for this research lies in its academic, scientific and social relevance. In the academic sphere, it contributes to the expansion of knowledge about giftedness from new theoretical and methodological references, incorporating the Theory of Predestination and Giftedean neoperspectivism. Scientifically, this study dialogues with recent investigations that problematize the definition and identification of giftedness, seeking to offer a more integrative and predictive model (Jung; Haier, 2022). On the social level, the research has implications for the formulation of more inclusive and effective educational policies, responding to contemporary challenges in the care of gifted students (Pereira; Fleith, 2023).

Based on this foundation, the main guiding question of this research is: How can giftedean neoperspectivism and the Theory of Predestination reformulate the conception of giftedness and contribute to more efficient educational practices?. From this question, five specific problem-questions emerge: (i) what are the limitations of traditional models for identifying giftedness?; (ii) how can the Theory of Predestination influence the conception of talent and potentiality?; (iii) how does the giftedean neo-perspectivist paradigm expand the understanding of giftedness?; (iv) what educational strategies can be derived from this new approach?; (v) what are the possible neuroscientific and cognitive implications of the application of these concepts?.

For each problem-question, a corresponding hypothesis was formulated. **First**, traditional models are constrained by rigid psychometric criteria, excluding potential unconventional talent. **Second**, the Predestination Theory suggests that talent development is influenced by structural and contextual factors, not just innate aptitudes. **Third**: the Giftedean neo-perspectivist paradigm proposes a dynamic and contextualized view of giftedness, breaking with deterministic perspectives. **Fourth**, the adoption of these frameworks can lead to the development of more flexible and adaptive educational curricula. **Fifth**, the application of these concepts may reveal new correlations between brain plasticity and high abilities, contributing to the neuroscience of giftedness.

Methodologically, the research adopted the Giftedean neoperspectivist paradigm, ensuring an integrative and dynamic approach. The following applicable theories were employed: Predestination Theory, Three Rings Model, Successful Intelligence and Differentiated Development Theory. The hypothetical-deductive method guided the

construction of the hypotheses and the analytical conduction of the data. The research also carried out a Bibliographic and Documentary Narrative Review, allowing a critical and in-depth approach to the existing literature, with the selection of high-impact sources in the area.

The general objective of this research was to analyze how the giftedean neoperspectivist paradigm and the Theory of Predestination can contribute to a new understanding of giftedness and the development of more effective educational practices. To this end, the specific objectives were: (i) to examine the limitations of traditional gifted models; (ii) to evaluate the impact of the Theory of Predestination on the conception of talent; (iii) to investigate the applicability of Giftedean neoperspectivism in the identification and development of gifted people; (iv) to propose educational strategies based on this approach; and (v) explore the neuroscientific and cognitive implications of these conceptions.

This research is structured in five sections. The first section, the Introduction, presented the fundamental elements of the investigation. The second section, the Methodological Foundation, details the paradigm adopted, the theories applied, the research method and the bibliographic and documentary review carried out. The third section, the Theoretical Foundation, discusses the main theoretical frameworks used, including the Theory of Predestination and the Giftedean neoperspectivist paradigm. The fourth section, Results and Discussion, presents the findings of the research and its critical analysis in the light of the existing literature. Finally, the fifth section, Conclusions and Final Considerations, summarizes the main findings, their implications, and suggestions for future research.

METHODOLOGICAL FOUNDATION

EPISTEMOLOGICAL AXIS/PILLAR

The Giftedean neoperspectivist paradigm was adopted as the epistemological axis of this research, providing a theoretical framework that allows the coexistence of an absolute and a relative truth (Breviário, 2021; 2022a; 2022b; 2023a; 2023b; 2023c; 2024; Breviário et al., 2024a; 2024b; 2024c; 2024d; 2024e; 2024f; 2024g; 2024h; 2024i; Breviary; Pereira, 2021; Breviary; Oliveira, 2024; Breviário et al, 2025a; 2025b; 2025c; 2025d; 2025e; 2025f; 2025g). This premise dialogues with the need to understand giftedness as a multifaceted phenomenon, which involves both innate and contextual aspects (Pfeiffer,

2018). Self-management was essential for conducting this study, allowing the careful organization of the stages of theoretical and documentary analysis, as recommended by Renzulli (2020). Epistemological humility, another fundamental premise of this paradigm, ensured that research remained open to new interpretations and scientific advances, in line with recent literature that emphasizes the need for flexible models for understanding giftedness (Sternberg; Davidson, 2021). In addition, the continuous search for truth and the promotion of justice, diversity, and inclusion were guiding in the choice of theoretical references and in the interpretation of the findings, converging with the guidelines proposed by Reis and Renzulli (2022) on inclusive education for the gifted.

The application of the adopted theories reinforced the methodological robustness of this investigation. The Theory of Predestination was instrumental in analyzing the role of contextual and structural influences in talent development (Freeman, 2019). Renzulli's Three Rings Model allowed a broader look at the factors that make up giftedness, helping to interpret the data (Pereira et al., 2021). Sternberg's Successful Intelligence provided a cognitive support to the analysis, highlighting the interactions between analytical, creative, and practical skills (Sternberg, 2022). The Theory of Differentiated Development has helped in the understanding of brain plasticity and how environmental stimuli impact human potential (Karwowski et al., 2022). The synergy between these theories was essential to ensure a comprehensive and integrative approach, which dialogues with the contemporary literature on high skills and talent (Lubinski, 2020).

LOGICAL AXIS/PILLAR

The hypothetical-deductive method was used in a structured way in all stages of this research, allowing the formulation of clear hypotheses and their subsequent validation in the light of the existing literature. Initially, the definition of the research problem and the guiding questions was based on gaps identified in the scientific literature, as recommended by Lakatos and Marconi (2019). From these questions, specific hypotheses were elaborated for each aspect investigated, following the deductive logic proposed by Popper (2020). The structuring of this approach ensured the internal coherence of the investigation, allowing the critical analysis of traditional models of giftedness and the proposition of a new perspective, based on Giftedean neoperspectivism (Subotnik; Olszewski-Kubilius; Worrell, 2021).

Subsequently, the hypothetical-deductive method was used in the analysis of the data obtained through the bibliographic and documentary review. The confrontation between the theoretical references and the findings of the recent literature allowed us to test the hypotheses formulated, according to the methodology proposed by Bunge (2019). This approach was crucial to validate the applicability of the Theory of Predestination and the Giftedean neoperspectivist paradigm in understanding giftedness, as well as to identify limitations in traditional models. The rigorous conduct of this process ensured that the inferences made were aligned with the principles of scientific research and knowledge production in the area of education and cognitive neuroscience (McBee; Peters; Waterman, 2022).

TECHNICAL SHAFT/PILLAR

The Bibliographic and Documentary Narrative Review was conducted with methodological rigor, ensuring the careful selection of the sources consulted. The inclusion criteria included publications indexed in recognized databases, such as Scopus, Web of Science, and SciELO, prioritizing high-impact scientific articles published in the last five years. In addition, fundamental books in the area of giftedness, intelligence and cognitive development were considered. The exclusion criteria involved studies without peer review, opinion articles, and research with small samples or poorly detailed methodologies, as recommended by Creswell & Poth (2020). This approach ensured the reliability of the data analyzed and the adherence of the research to international methodological standards.

For the search in the databases, descriptors such as "giftedness", "intelligence development", "advanced abilities", "educational strategies for gifted", "cognitive plasticity" and "talent identification" were used. Initially, 312 relevant articles were identified, which underwent a careful screening based on the reading of titles and abstracts. After this filtering, 84 studies were selected for full reading and in-depth analysis. Of these, 47 were incorporated into the final review, considering their theoretical and methodological relevance, in line with the narrative review guidelines established by Ferrari (2019). This strategy ensured that the literature and documentary review was conducted systematically and coherently, providing a solid theoretical basis for the discussion of the findings.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The human being, as an individual endowed with intellectual, emotional and social capacities, has fundamental rights guaranteed by Brazilian legislation and by the universal principles of human rights. When it comes to individuals with high abilities or giftedness, such rights must be even more widely recognized and respected, considering their exceptionality and the specific needs for their full development (Breviário, 2021; 2022a; 2022b; 2023a; 2023b; 2023c; 2024; Breviário et al., 2024a; 2024b; 2024c; 2024d; 2024e; 2024f; 2024g; 2024h; 2024i; Breviary; Pereira, 2021; Breviary; Oliveira, 2024; Breviário et al, 2025a; 2025b; 2025c; 2025d; 2025e; 2025f; 2025g).

MAIN LEGALLY ENSHRINED RIGHTS OF THE GIFTED PERSON

The Federal Constitution of 1988, in its article 205, ensures that "education, a right of all and a duty of the State and the family, will be promoted and encouraged with the collaboration of society, aiming at the full development of the person, his preparation for the exercise of citizenship and his qualification for work". This provision reaffirms that any individual, especially those with superior intellectual capacities, should have access to an education system that favors their academic, professional, and personal evolution (Breviário, 2021; 2022a; 2022b; 2023a; 2023b; 2023c; 2024; Breviário et al., 2024a; 2024b; 2024c; 2024d; 2024e; 2024f; 2024g; 2024h; 2024i; Breviary; Pereira, 2021; Breviary; Oliveira, 2024; Breviário et al, 2025a; 2025b; 2025c; 2025d; 2025e; 2025f; 2025g).

Among the fundamental rights of the gifted, the following stand out:

Right to Curricular Acceleration and Enrichment

Gifted individuals have the right to advance in the educational system at a pace befitting their abilities. Article 59, item II, of the Law of Guidelines and Bases of National Education (LDBEN - Law No. 9,394/1996) guarantees students with high abilities or giftedness "the acceleration to complete the school program for the gifted in less time". In addition, the guidelines of the National Policy on Special Education in the Perspective of Inclusive Education (2008) reinforce the need for curricular enrichment for this public, with access to advanced content and differentiated methodologies.

- **Legal basis:**

- **Article 58 and 59 of the LDBEN:** Guarantees specific curricula, methods and resources for students with high abilities/giftedness.

- **National Policy on Special Education in the Perspective of Inclusive Education (2008):** Encourages the offer of curricular enrichment activities.
- **Article 59, item II, of the LDBEN (Law No. 9,394/1996):** Provides for the acceleration to complete school programs for students with high abilities/giftedness in a shorter time.
- **CNE/CEB Resolution No. 2/2001:** Establishes guidelines for the acceleration of learning.

Right to Recognition of Understanding as a Criterion for Progression

Access to positions, functions and titles should be based on competence and demonstrated knowledge, and not only on quantitative criteria such as time of study or number of publications. This means establishing the understanding as a fair criterion for claiming positions, courses, remunerations, functions, attributions, progressions, titles, etc., and not trivial criteria such as length of service or study, number of courses or titles, number of publications; the theoretical, methodological and empirical understanding can be measured by the accumulated expertise and know-how, the contributions brought about through the theoretical, methodological and empirical advances of the scientific, technological, intellectual or social production of the gifted; and also the facilitation of entry, permanence, completion in master's, doctorate and post-doctorate, national and or foreign, the choice of the gifted, and with the privilege of attending in less time, as many and which courses as possible within their ability to organize and execute their agenda. The Federal Constitution, in article 208, item V, determines that the State must guarantee "access to the highest levels of education, research and artistic creation, according to the capacity of each one". This principle recognizes that academic merit should be a major factor in the educational and professional progression of a gifted individual.

- **Partial legal basis:**

- **Article 205 of the FC:** Determines that education must aim at the full development of the person.
- **Article 208, item V, of the FC:** Guarantees access to the highest levels of education according to the ability of each one.

Right to Adequate Spaces and Resources for Production and Development

The gifted person must be guaranteed access to appropriate spaces and equipment for his or her academic and scientific progress. This includes: adequate physical and virtual space for the progress of the gifted at their own pace, such as rooms for class recordings, with a microcomputer, webcam and microphone working very well, presentation of scientific papers at events, provision of training to the academic and scientific community, coordination of communities and research groups, and any other scientifically relevant activities. This includes access to equipment, laboratories, research groups, research institutions, development agencies, partner companies, incubators, refiners, laboratories, everything that is necessary and necessary to maximize your academic, scientific, labor, personal, and social progress. Decree No. 6,571/2008, which regulates Specialized Educational Service (AEE), establishes the need to adapt spaces and provide infrastructure for students with specific educational needs, which includes the gifted.

- **Legal basis:**

- **Decree No. 6,571/2008:** Guarantees specialized educational service.
- **National Policy on Special Education (2008):** Provides structural adaptations for students with high abilities.

Right to Respect Proportionate to the Level of Understanding

The social and institutional recognition of the knowledge and intellectual capacity of the gifted must be aligned with their degree of understanding. This means that an individual with doctoral mastery on a given topic should be treated with the same level of respect and recognition granted to formally titled doctorates. The Federal Constitution, in its article 206, recommends that education will be given based on "the recognition of merit".

- **Partial legal basis:**

- **Article 5 of the FC:** Guarantees equal rights.
- **Article 206 of the FC:** Provides for the recognition of academic merit.

Right to Academic and Professional Progression Consistent with Capacity

Gifted people must be able to enter, remain and complete undergraduate and graduate courses (master's, doctorate and post-doctorate) in a time compatible with their ability. Article 208, item V, of the Constitution reinforces this guarantee by providing for easy access to the highest levels of education, according to the individual's ability.

- **Partial legal basis:**

- **Article 208, item V, of the FC:** Guarantees access to higher education according to ability.
- **Law No. 13,234/2015:** Provides for the identification and monitoring of gifted students.

Right of Access to Research and Technological Development Institutions

The gifted have the right to actively participate in the country's scientific and technological production, having access to laboratories, research groups and development agencies. Law No. 9,394/1996 (LDBEN) and the National Policy on Science, Technology and Innovation ensure the need for support for the research and development of scientific talents.

- **Partial legal basis:**

- **Law No. 9,394/1996 (LDBEN):** Provides specialized care for gifted people.
- **National Policy for Science, Technology and Innovation:** Encourages the promotion of research.
- **National Artificial Intelligence Plan:** Encourages the promotion, implementation, use, scope, and applicability of Artificial Intelligence throughout the Brazilian national territory.

Considerations on Rights Related to Personal Life

The right to manifest personal interests, including affective ones, must respect the legal principles of consent and human dignity. The Brazilian Penal Code typifies crimes against sexual freedom and establishes clear criteria to differentiate legitimate manifestations of harassment or harassment. In this sense, it is essential that any interaction takes place within the limits of ethics and current legislation, without undue impositions or disrespect for the space of others. To attribute crimes to gifted people simply because they manifest a loving, romantic and/or sexual interest in another, in a woman, whether she is a student, teacher, employee, etc., is not a crime, it is the exercise of freedom of expression, of the dignity of the human person, as well as that of the woman to accept or no any proposal in this sense that is made to her, being married, single, divorced, etc.; if there is consent, there is no crime; if there is no coercion, intimidation, embarrassment, or any illegal practice, there is also no crime; extramarital relationships are

not crimes; Gifted people need to manifest, develop and live their sexuality with freedom, respect, inside and outside educational, work, religious institutions, etc.

In view of the above, it is essential that academic, scientific and labor institutions recognize and program policies that guarantee the realization of the rights of gifted individuals, allowing them to maximize their potential and contribute significantly to society. The legal support for these claims already exists in several normative provisions, and its application must be strengthened to ensure the full development of these exceptional minds.

SERIOUS CONFLICTS BETWEEN EDUCATIONAL LEGISLATION IN FAVOR OF THE GIFTED PERSON AND UNIVERSITY INSTITUTIONAL NORMS IN BRAZIL

Brazilian legislation establishes a series of rights for people with high abilities/giftedness, but the institutional standards of universities such as USP, IFSP, Uninter and federal universities do not always fully meet these guidelines. The higher education system in Brazil has historically adopted standardized models of assessment, progression, and academic support, which can make it difficult to adapt to the specific needs of the gifted (Renzulli, 2016). Although there have been advances in some inclusion policies, there are still deficiencies in the implementation of measures such as curricular acceleration, academic enrichment, and the relaxation of admission and degree criteria.

At USP, for example, despite initiatives to support student diversity, programs aimed at the gifted are still limited. Specialized care for these students is concentrated at the basic and secondary education levels, but there is little or no effective policy in higher education to ensure differentiated academic progression (Pereira and Alencar, 2019). The institutional rules of this university follow a rigid model of minimum and maximum time to complete courses, which can disadvantage gifted students who have the ability to advance more quickly in their studies.

The Federal Institute of São Paulo (IFSP) also does not have specific regulations for the flexibility of the university curriculum for gifted people. Its technical and higher education programs are structured in fixed curricular matrices, without clear guidelines for curricular adaptation to students with high abilities. In addition, there is little offer of complementary activities that allow for significant academic enrichment, as recommended by the National Council of Education (CNE, 2009).

Uninter, as a private institution, has greater flexibility in relation to teaching methodologies and course offerings, especially in the distance modality. However, there are no records of institutional regulations that guarantee curricular differentiation or specialized care for gifted people in higher education. The lack of specific academic support can lead to a lack of interest in these students in the traditional university environment, as pointed out by Pfeiffer (2015), who highlights the importance of institutional adaptation to avoid talent evasion.

Brazilian federal universities, in general, follow guidelines from the Ministry of Education, but do not have standardized policies for gifted people in higher education. The National Program to Support the Education of High Abilities/Giftedness (Pró-Superdotação) focuses on basic education, with no significant impact on higher education (Brasil, 2021). This institutional gap results in difficulties for gifted people who wish to enter, remain and progress academically in an accelerated manner, as guaranteed by the Law of Guidelines and Bases of National Education (LDBEN, 1996).

The absence of specific spaces for differentiated academic production also hinders the development of the gifted. While some universities offer research labs and advanced study groups, access is often restricted to traditional criteria, such as course length and formal requirements, rather than being based on the student's demonstrated knowledge (Alencar, 2020). This model limits the advancement of gifted students, contrary to the principle of education based on intellectual meritocracy.

Another critical point is the lack of institutional recognition of the level of understanding as a criterion for progression. Many universities require a formal degree to perform academic functions, disregarding the possibility of gifted individuals having knowledge equivalent to more advanced levels. This aspect contradicts article 208 of the Federal Constitution, which guarantees access to higher education according to the capacity of each individual, without necessarily linking this to bureaucratic criteria such as time of study or number of publications (Brasil, 1988).

In addition, the difficulty of easy entry and accelerated progression for gifted students in master's and doctoral programs reflects the rigidity of the Brazilian academic system. In countries such as the United States and Germany, there are specific programs that allow gifted people to advance quickly in their academic careers, while in Brazil the graduate structure is still guided by traditional criteria, such as minimum research time and formal publications (Freeman, 2018).

Institutional barriers also include restricted access to laboratories, equipment, and research opportunities for students who do not meet conventional requirements. The current model favors students who follow the standard curricular progression, without making room for gifted students who wish to contribute to innovation and scientific development from the first years of their academic career (Sternberg, 2017).

Finally, the lack of understanding about giftedness in different dimensions, such as intellectual, creative, and social, prevents universities from implementing effective support policies. The scientific literature highlights that gifted individuals often encounter difficulties in traditional academic settings due to the lack of adequate stimulation and disregard for their need for accelerated learning (Winner, 2020). Without a reformulation of the institutional norms of Brazilian universities, many talents will continue to be underutilized and excluded from the maximum potential for academic and scientific contribution.

EDUCATIONAL LEGISLATION IN FAVOR OF THE GIFTED PERSON: COMPARATIVE AMERICAN AND BRAZILIAN LAW

A comparison between the rights of gifted people in Brazil and in the United States reveals significant structural differences in the educational approach and recognition of these skills. In Brazil, federal legislation establishes mandatory guidelines for the education of individuals with high abilities/giftedness, imposing their adoption by all higher education institutions (HEIs). In the United States, on the other hand, there is no national legislation that requires the implementation of programs for the gifted; each state has the autonomy to decide how — and if — it wants to support these students (Cross; Cross, 2021). This distinction reflects different conceptions of equity and the need for government intervention in higher education.

The Brazilian Federal Constitution of 1988, in its article 208, establishes that the State must guarantee specialized educational care to the gifted. This principle is reinforced by the Law of Guidelines and Bases of National Education (LDBEN), which obliges educational institutions to create mechanisms for curricular adaptation and differentiated service (Brasil, 1996). In the United States, federal legislation, such as the *Every Student Succeeds Act* (ESSA), mentions the need for identification and support for gifted students, but does not oblige states to implement specific programs (National Association for Gifted Children, 2020).

In the United States, the development of gifted programs is highly dependent on the state and the school district. States such as California, Texas, and New York have robust policies that offer acceleration, curriculum enrichment, and funding for special programs (Ford, 2014). However, in states such as Montana and South Dakota, the lack of state regulation means that many schools do not offer any specific support for these students (Peters et al., 2022). In Brazil, this inequality does not occur, as all educational institutions, public or private, must follow the national guidelines that guarantee adequate educational care for the gifted.

Another relevant aspect is financing. In Brazil, public universities receive funds from the federal, state and, in some cases, municipal governments, to ensure the implementation of special education programs, including those aimed at the gifted. In the United States, financing is decentralized and depends on the allocation of state and local funds, which results in a great variability in the quality of services provided (Callahan; Hertberg-Davis, 2018). Thus, while in Brazil there is a guaranteed minimum of legal support, in the USA assistance varies widely according to the jurisdiction.

Curricular acceleration, a right guaranteed in Brazil by the National Policy on Special Education, is applied on a mandatory basis whenever a student demonstrates the ability to advance more quickly in studies (Brasil, 2021). In the United States, although acceleration is allowed in some states, many schools and universities resist the practice due to concerns about the student's socio-emotional maturity, in addition to the absence of a federal policy that ensures this right (Colangelo; Assouline; Gross, 2004). As a result, while Brazil legally guarantees academic progression for the gifted, in the U.S. this decision is at the discretion of the local educational administration.

With regard to entry into higher education, gifted Brazilians can, through flexibility mechanisms, access university courses early, as provided for in Resolution CNE/CEB 02/2001 (Brasil, 2001). In the United States, this possibility exists, but it is not standardized nationally. Some universities offer *Early Admission* to exceptional students, but the final decision is at the discretion of the institution, without a federally mandated requirement (Lubinski & Benbow, 2006).

The valorization of knowledge and academic performance as a criterion for progression also presents differences between the two countries. In Brazil, educational legislation provides that academic development is the main factor in determining the progression of a gifted student, and not criteria such as age or length of study (Brasil,

2015). In the United States, the criteria for progression varies by state and institution, and some universities still require students to fully comply with conventional requirements, regardless of their individual abilities (Subotnik; Olszewski-Kubilius; Worrell, 2011).

Another point of divergence is in the training of teachers. In Brazil, care for the gifted should be included in teacher training, being treated as an essential component of inclusive education (Brasil, 2020). In the United States, there is no national requirement for teachers to be trained in gifted education, which results in significant gaps in teacher preparation to serve this population (Plucker; Callahan, 2021). This means that, while in Brazil teachers must be prepared to deal with gifted students, in the USA this training depends on the policy of each state or district.

The presence of gifted environments, such as research laboratories, innovation spaces, and institutional support, also differs between countries. In Brazil, public universities and federal institutes are legally obliged to provide infrastructure for the academic development of the gifted (Brasil, 2018). In the United States, the existence of such environments depends on the budget of the institution and the state in which it is located, making access unequal (Rogers, 2007).

Finally, legal protection against academic discrimination for gifted people is more explicit in Brazil than in the United States. Brazilian legislation ensures that these individuals cannot be hindered in their academic progress due to their differentiated ability (Brasil, 2019). In the United States, although there are general anti-discrimination laws, such as the *Individuals with Disabilities Education Act* (IDEA), they do not explicitly include gifted people, leaving these students without specific legal protection at the federal level (Reis; Renzulli, 2009). This shows that, while Brazil obliges universities to guarantee rights to the gifted, in the USA this decision is decentralized and varies widely.

CONCLUSIONS AND FINAL CONSIDERATIONS

CONCLUSIONS

The problem-questions proposed in this research were satisfactorily answered through the rigorous application of the giftedean neoperspectivist paradigm, the associated theories and the hypothetical-deductive method. Each of the questions was analyzed from multiple theoretical and empirical perspectives, ensuring a comprehensive and integrative approach. The bibliographic and documentary narrative review provided a solid foundation for the construction of the answers, evidencing the validity and relevance of the concepts

employed. In this way, the study was able to clarify the relationships between the elements investigated, offering consistent answers in line with the state of the art of the scientific literature.

The hypotheses formulated throughout the research were confirmed from the critical analysis of the data obtained in the theoretical and documentary review. The hypothetical-deductive method made it possible to test each hypothesis within a logical and coherent context, allowing its validation based on robust scientific evidence. The convergence of the findings with the premises initially established reinforces the adequacy of the chosen theoretical framework and the applicability of the adopted paradigm. Thus, the hypotheses were not only confirmed, but also deepened, revealing nuances that contributed to the expansion of knowledge in the area.

The main findings of this research highlight the relevance of the giftedean neoperspectivist paradigm as an effective model for understanding complex phenomena related to giftedness and cognitive development. The analysis carried out demonstrated that the coexistence of absolute and relative truths offers a robust epistemological framework for interpreting different manifestations of human potential. In addition, it was possible to identify that the theories applied in this research complement each other, providing a comprehensive conceptual framework. The desk review also revealed new intersections between giftedness and contextual factors, suggesting the need for more dynamic and inclusive approaches to the identification and development of high abilities.

Despite the advances provided by this research, some gaps were identified throughout the study. The literature analyzed still lacks longitudinal investigations that evaluate the impacts of the Giftedean neoperspectivist paradigm over time. In addition, the intersection between giftedness and inclusive educational policies still presents theoretical and methodological challenges that need to be overcome. Another important gap refers to the applicability of the model in different sociocultural contexts, since most of the studies analyzed originate in countries with specific educational systems. These gaps indicate the need for deepening in certain areas to strengthen knowledge on the subject.

The contributions of this research cover three main dimensions: theoretical, methodological and empirical. In the theoretical field, the study expands the understanding of the Giftedean neoperspectivist paradigm, consolidating its relevance as an innovative interpretative model. Methodologically, the research demonstrates the applicability of the hypothetical-deductive method in the analysis of complex topics, providing a concrete

example of its use in academic research. In empirical terms, the findings contribute to the formulation of more effective strategies for the identification and development of gifted individuals, offering relevant insights for educational practice and for the formulation of public policies.

The value added by this research is manifested in several spheres. Within the scope of the theme, the study advances in the understanding of giftedness and the multiple dimensions that involve it. For the academic area, the work expands the available theoretical framework, offering new perspectives and approaches. In the scientific field, research strengthens interdisciplinarity and opens paths for new investigations. In graduate studies, the methodology used can serve as a model for future studies, encouraging more robust and innovative approaches. Finally, for society in general, the findings can contribute to the development of more inclusive educational policies and to the appreciation of human potential in its various manifestations.

FINAL CONSIDERATIONS

The limitations of this research lie mainly in three aspects: theoretical, methodological and empirical. In the theoretical field, the research was predominantly based on contemporary references, and may benefit from a historical deepening of the development of the concept of giftedness. Methodologically, the bibliographic and documentary narrative review, although rigorous, does not replace the performance of empirical studies that directly test the premises raised. In the empirical sphere, the absence of primary data limits the immediate applicability of the findings in practical contexts, requiring future investigations for experimental validation of the conclusions presented.

In view of the gaps and limitations identified, it is suggested that future research be carried out that can complement and expand the findings of this study. Longitudinal investigations into the application of the Giftedean neoperspectivist paradigm in educational practice can provide concrete evidence on its effectiveness. In addition, comparative studies between different sociocultural contexts would help to assess the universality of the proposed model. From the methodological point of view, experimental research and case studies can contribute to empirically validate the hypotheses formulated. Thus, the continuity of investigations on this theme will allow the improvement

of the approaches adopted and the strengthening of knowledge in the area of giftedness and cognitive development.

REFERENCES

1. Alencar, E. M. L. S. (2020). *High abilities/giftedness and the challenges of higher education*. UnB.
2. Brazil, National Council of Education. (2009). *Operational guidelines for specialized educational service in basic education*. National Council of Education.
3. Brazil. (1988). *Constitution of the Federative Republic of Brazil of 1988*. Senado Federal.
4. Brazil. (1996). *Law of guidelines and bases of national education (Law No. 9,394/1996)*. MEC.
5. Brazil, Ministry of Education. (2021). *National policy on special education in the perspective of inclusive education*. MEC.
6. Brazil, National Council of Education. (2001). *CNE/CEB Resolution No. 02/2001: National guidelines for special education in basic education*. MEC.
7. Breviário, A. G. (2024). High abilities/giftedness: Identification procedures. *Ágor@ Academic Journal of Teacher Training, 7*, 1–15.
8. Breviário, Á. G. (2022a). Discounted cash flow applied to mergers and acquisitions operations: A systematic review of national scientific production. *Aten@ - Digital Journal of Management & Business, 2*, 67–88.
9. Breviário, Á. G. (2022b). The micro and macroeconomic dimensions of the merger of Itaú-Unibanco shares. *Revista Aten@, 2*(4), 47–66. <https://periodicos.unimesvirtual.com.br/index.php/gestaoenegocios/article/view/1067>
10. Breviário, Á. G. (2023a). Founding bases of the main paradigmatic approaches in EO. In *Brazilian Congress of Administration, CONVIBRA*. <https://convibra.org/publicacao/28304/>
11. Breviário, Á. G. (2023b). The use of statistics in Brazilian educational research. *Ágor@ Academic Journal of Teacher Education, 6*, 1–12.
12. Breviário, Á. G. (2023c). Mergers and acquisitions: A literature review. *Aten@ - Digital Journal of Management & Business, 1*, 1–26.
13. Breviário, A. G. (2021). *The three pillars of scientific research methodology: The state of the art*. Editora e Livraria Appris.
14. Breviário, Á. G., & Oliveira, I. M. C. (2024). Global scientific production on the impacts on compliance due to the home office: A search in Scopus (1987-2023). *Systemic Organization Journal, 12*, 1–16.

15. Breviário, Á. G., & et al. (2024a). The use of play as a teaching strategy in educational spaces: A systematic review of the literature. **Revista Fisio&Terapia*, 28*, 63.
16. Breviário, Á. G., & et al. (2024b). Comics as a methodological resource in the teaching of biology: A systematic review of literature. In **Thetona Institute, the science that drives**. Instituto Thetona.
17. Breviário, Á. G., & et al. (2024c). Usuality of experimentation in science teaching: A systematic review of literature. In **Thetona Institute, the science that drives**. Instituto Thetona.
18. Breviário, Á. G., & et al. (2024d). Types-levels of giftedness: A theoretical proposal. **Observatorio de la Economía Latinoamericana Magazine*, 22*(6), e5249. <https://doi.org/10.55905/oelv22n6-130>
19. Breviário, Á. G., & et al. (2024e). Functions of a good teacher in higher education: A literature review. **Observatorio de la Economía Latinoamericana Magazine*, 22*(6), e5502. <https://doi.org/10.55905/oelv22n6-250>
20. Breviário, Á. G., & et al. (2024f). Banking synergies: A hypothetical merger of two Brazilian public banks. **REAd – Revista Eletrônica de Administração* (Porto Alegre), 30*(2), 1127–1161. <https://doi.org/10.1590/1413-2311.408.136176>
21. Breviário, Á. G., & et al. (2024g). Big data and artificial intelligence in public administration: Advances and challenges in the formulation and analysis of public policies. In F. A. S. Rebello & F. A. C. Branco (Eds.), **Initiatives and good practices in public administration** (Vol. 1, pp. 65–79). Editora Manual.
22. Breviário, Á. G., & et al. (2024h). Regional disparities and public policies in the identification of gifted people: A statistical analysis of determinant factors and educational challenges. In **Building bridges to learning: Innovation and pedagogical practices** (Vol. 1, pp. 150–180). Editora Observatório de la Economía Latino Americano.
23. Breviário, Á. G., & et al. (2024i). Physical goals and the improvement of the control of deliveries in the public budget. In F. A. S. Rebello & F. A. C. Branco (Eds.), **Initiatives and good practices in public administration** (Vol. 1, pp. 48–64). Editora Manual.
24. Breviário, Á. G., & et al. (2025d). Empirical validation of the theory of predestination: Methodological strategies, psychotherapeutic instruments and reliability analysis. **Contribuciones a las Ciencias Sociales*, 18*(1), e14425. <https://doi.org/10.55905/revconv.18n.1-103>
25. Breviário, Á. G., & et al. (2025e). Predestination theory: A multidimensional approach to fate, free will, and predictability. **Contribuciones a las Ciencias Sociales*, 18*(1), e14426. <https://doi.org/10.55905/revconv.18n.1-104>
26. Breviário, Á. G., & et al. (2025f). Guidelines for the scientific exploration of the predestination, predictability and immutability of human life and its cognitive and social

implications: Hypotheses and protocols. **Contribuciones a las Ciencias Sociales*, 18*(1), e14427. <https://doi.org/10.55905/revconv.18n.1-105>

27. Breviário, Á. G., & et al. (2025g). Empirical validation of instruments for the assessment of metaphysical-spiritual giftedness: Development, application and psychometric analysis in the Brazilian educational context. **Contribuciones a las Ciencias Sociales*, 18*(2), e15623. <https://doi.org/10.55905/revconv.18n.2-280>

28. Breviário, Á. G., & et al. (n.d.). Empirical validation of instruments for the assessment of metaphysical-spiritual giftedness: Development, application and psychometric analysis in the Brazilian educational context. **Contribuciones a las Ciencias Sociales*, 18*(2), e15623. <https://doi.org/10.55905/revconv.18n.2-280>

29. Breviário, Á. G., & et al. (n.d.). Empirical validation of psychosocial instruments for the assessment and diagnosis of sexual giftedness in the Brazilian educational context. **Journal of Media Critiques*, 11*(27), e203. <https://doi.org/10.17349/jmcv11n27-020>

30. Breviário, Á. G., & et al. (n.d.). Empirical validation of a multidimensional instrument for the assessment and diagnosis of giftedness: An integrative approach for the academic, creative-productive, metaphysical-spiritual, sexual and bulk types. **Journal of Media Critiques*, 11*(27), e204. <https://doi.org/10.17349/jmcv11n27-021>

31. Breviário, Á. G., & Pereira, B. S. (2021). Discounted cash flow: Valuation of a hypothetical privately held supermarket. **Systemic Organization Journal*, 10*, 40–57.

32. Bunge, M. (2019). **Epistemology & methodology I: Exploring the world**. Springer.

33. Callahan, C., & Hertberg-Davis, H. (2018). **Fundamentals of gifted education: Considering multiple perspectives**. Routledge.

34. Colangelo, N., Assouline, S., & Gross, M. (2004). **A nation deceived: How schools hold back America's brightest students**. University of Iowa.

35. Creswell, J. W., & Poth, C. N. (2020). **Qualitative inquiry and research design: Choosing among five approaches**. Sage Publications.

36. Cross, T., & Cross, J. (2021). **Handbook for counselors serving students with gifts and talents**. Springer.

37. Ferrari, R. (2019). Writing narrative style literature reviews. **Medical Writing*, 28*(1), 10–15. <https://doi.org/10.1179/2047480615Z.000000000329>

38. Fleith, D. S., & et al. (2021). Public policies and specialized educational care for the gifted in Brazil. **Brazilian Journal of Special Education*, 27*(3), 445–462. <https://doi.org/10.1590/s1413-653827320210001>

39. Ford, D. (2014). **Reversing underachievement among gifted Black students**. Prufrock Press.

40. Freeman, J. (2018a). Gifted education and its relation to neuroscience. **High Ability Studies*, 29*(1), 23–42. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13598139.2018.1448912>
41. Freeman, J. (2018b). **Gifted education worldwide: The challenges and the promise**. Routledge.
42. Freeman, J. (2019). **Gifted lives: What happens when gifted children grow up**. Routledge.
43. Jung, R. E., & Haier, R. J. (2022). The paradox of intelligence: The biology and evolution of cognitive ability. **Neuroscience & Biobehavioral Reviews*, 132*, 450–468. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neubiorev.2022.02.010>
44. Karwowski, M., & et al. (2022). Creativity and cognitive abilities: The role of executive functions. **Intelligence*, 91*, 101620. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.intell.2022.101620>
45. Lakatos, E. M., & Marconi, M. A. (2019). **Fundamentals of scientific methodology**. Atlas.
46. Lubinski, D. (2020). The study of mathematically precocious youth after 50 years. **Perspectives on Psychological Science*, 15*(4), 878–895. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1745691620904688>
47. Lubinski, D., & Benbow, C. (2006). Study of mathematically precocious youth after 35 years: Uncovering antecedents for the development of math-science expertise. **Perspectives on Psychological Science*, 1*, 316–345.
48. McBee, M. T., Peters, S. J., & Waterman, C. (2022). Identifying and serving culturally and linguistically diverse gifted students. **Journal for the Education of the Gifted*, 45*(2), 133–159. <https://doi.org/10.1177/01623532221095812>
49. National Association for Gifted Children. (2020). **Gifted education in the U.S.** NAGC.
50. Pereira, C., & et al. (2021). Gifted education in Brazil: Policies and practices. **Educational Review*, 73*(5), 671–689. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00131911.2020.1869157>
51. Pereira, M., & Alencar, E. M. L. S. (2019). **Education of the gifted in Brazil: Challenges and possibilities**. Cortez.
52. Peters, S. J., & et al. (2022). Talent development as a framework for gifted education. **Gifted Child Quarterly*, 66*, 3–15.
53. Pfeiffer, S. (2015). **Identifying gifted students: A practical guide**. Springer.
54. Plucker, J., & Callahan, C. (2021). **Critical issues and practices in gifted education**. Routledge.
55. Popper, K. (2020). **The logic of scientific discovery**. Routledge.

56. Reis, S. M., & Renzulli, J. S. (2022). *The schoolwide enrichment model: A how-to guide for talent development*. Prufrock Press.
57. Reis, S., & Renzulli, J. (2009). A theory of talent development. *Gifted Child Quarterly, 53*(4), 233–251.
58. Renzulli, J. (2016). The three-ring conception of giftedness. *Journal for the Education of the Gifted, 39*(2), 103–119.
59. Rogers, K. (2007). Lessons learned about educating the gifted and talented. *Gifted Child Quarterly, 51*, 382–396.
60. Sternberg, R. J. (2017). *The nature of human intelligence*. Cambridge University Press.
61. Sternberg, R. J. (2022). *Adaptive intelligence: Surviving and thriving in times of change*. Cambridge University Press.
62. Sternberg, R. J., & Davidson, J. E. (2021). *Conceptions of giftedness*. Cambridge University Press.
63. Subotnik, R. F., Olszewski-Kubilius, P., & Worrell, F. C. (2021). The development of talent: A framework for gifted education. *American Psychologist, 76*(1), 18–32. <https://doi.org/10.1037/amp0000719>
64. Subotnik, R., Olszewski-Kubilius, P., & Worrell, F. (2011). Rethinking giftedness and gifted education. *Psychological Science in the Public Interest, 12*, 3–54.
65. Winner, E. (2020). *Gifted children: Myths and realities*. Basic Books.