Eccentric and creative, or manic? Intense and reflective, or obsessive compulsive? Where is the line between normal gifted adjustment and maladjustment? How does one differentiate typical gifted behaviors from the characteristics of certain disorders? For example, when do we say that a gifted boy exhibits "psychomotor intensity" and lacks challenge in the school curriculum, and when do we diagnose him with attention deficit hyperactivity disorder? Where is the line that divides mild autism from prodigious talent in a highly introverted and sensitive gifted person? When is it simply perfectionism, and when is it compulsive behavior? How and where we each draw the line depends on the lenses we wear. Culture, training, values, and the setting in which our lives intersect with the gifted all influence our decisions. A teacher wears a different lens than does a physician, a school psychologist, or a parent.

Clinicians are trained to treat disease, but few are familiar with the subtleties of gifted children’s development. Educators are trained to teach, but few are familiar with the nuances of developing abnormal conditions in children. Behaviors and attitudes that might be attributed to maladjustment from one perspective could be attributed to giftedness from another.

There is a need for discussion that raises everyone’s awareness about the confluence of gifted development, creativity, and maladjustment. The question seems to (see NEIHART, page 10)
FROM THE PRESIDENT

Krys Goree

Happy 2001! What an exciting year for those of us who are involved in education!

This issue of Tempo focuses on the timely and timeless topic of social and emotional needs of gifted youngsters. This topic is especially appropriate because, in my mind and heart, it relates to every other topic that could possibly encompass the notion of appropriate identification and services for the gifted. If we do not target the affective needs of youngsters, there is no possible way to provide a productive educational setting in which they might thrive.

"Mrs. Goree, when my heart hurts my head just won’t work!” I’ll never forget the gifted first grader who approached my desk one October morning to share this revelation with me. The look on the child’s face clearly communicated an understanding of self and deep inner-feelings.

There are many children sitting in classrooms around our state whose hearts are hurting. They may be hurting because of personal problems. They may be hurting because their academic needs are neither recognized nor addressed. They may be hurting simply because of their tendencies to be sensitive, intense, and perfectionistic.

Whatever the case, we can be sure that effective assessment practices, curriculum, program design, staff development, and/or family and community involvement will not impact children in the way that we desire if their social and emotional needs are not addressed.

We are very fortunate to have an editor, Michael Cannon, who seeks the work of experts in the field of gifted education and provides cutting-edge information and research to the members of TAGT through Tempo. We must utilize this information and make a conscious effort to stay informed, carefully reading the research and delving into issues that directly affect gifted children.

As we venture into the New Year, I invite you to join me in actively targeting the many needs of the gifted students in our state. This is a legislative year in the state of Texas, meaning that our governmental leaders will be making very important decisions. Some of the issues they address will directly affect those for whom we advocate –

(see GOREE, page 23)
On April 2000, the TAGT Executive Board adopted four planks for its 77th Legislature Position Paper. Subsequently, the Board adopted its entire position paper on September 16, 2000. Your active support for these positions is crucially important if these priorities and plans are to become reality for gifted students in Texas. Please contact me at txgifted_abatson@yahoo.com if you are interested in participating in the TAGT 77th Legislature Network (also known as the TAGT Legislative Action Team).

THE MISSION OF TEXAS ASSOCIATION FOR THE GIFTED AND TALENTED
The Texas Association for the Gifted and Talented is a not-for-profit corporation whose goal is to promote awareness of the unique social, emotional and intellectual needs of gifted children and to impact the development of appropriate services to meet these needs. TAGT has been working for a quarter of a century with educators and parents to develop appropriate services for these children and to set high standards and clear accountability measures for all Texas schoolchildren.

INTRODUCTION
The Texas Association for the Gifted and Talented seeks to build upon current education policy in Texas to assure high standards with well-defined accountability measures for the education of gifted and talented students in grades kindergarten-12.

According to Section 3.1A of The Texas State Plan for the Education of Gifted/Talented Students, “[s]chool districts shall provide an array of appropriately challenging learning experiences for gifted/talented students in grades 1 through 12 that emphasize content from the four core academic areas.” Further, according to state guidelines, curriculum and instruction for gifted students must be addressed by “modifying the depth, complexity, and pacing of the general school program.”

Yet, despite these expectations in existing policy, for most of the 330,000 gifted students across the state, the operative policy is one of benign satisfaction, minimal focus and merely adequate attention because, after all, these students will “make it anyway.” This attitude is unfair and inappropriate. The fundamental mission of TAGT is to contest this attitude vigorously. Beginning now, and working with the 77th Legislature, TAGT will replace this attitude with the view that all children, including gifted children, should be challenged and educated to learn and develop to their fullest potential.

TAGT is aware and fully supportive of the state’s accountability system. All Texans, particularly the legislative and civic leaders who put this system in place, should be proud, as the Rand Corporation recently concluded, that Texas leads the nation in educational improvement for its youngsters. Yet, even with our remarkable gains, we cannot relax or be content. Our curriculum, the Texas Essential Knowledge and Skills, is more rigorous. Our tests are becoming more difficult, and the bar for graduating from high school is being raised dramatically. We must continue
Legends Through the Looking Glass

James R. Delisle

“Once heard a professor of medicine say to his students at the conclusion of a course: ‘Within five years, about one-half of what I have told you will either be untrue or not worth a darn. This doesn’t really bother me; but what does irritate me is that I can’t even tell you which half is which!'”

―Sidney Parnes, 1981, p. 21

Like everything else in life, the field of gifted child education (GCE) enters recurring cycles. Ideas spiral from generation to generation about the best ways to identify, educate and understand gifted children, and these views are shared at conferences and in publications like TEMPO.

New faces and names enter our field, hobnobbing with the “old standbys” whose memories are long enough to remember when Dorothy Sisk ran the Office of Gifted and Talented in Washington, DC, Joyce Juntune directed the National Association for Gifted Children (NAGC) from St. Paul, and Sandy Kaplan worked at a place in California whose acronym always seemed too long: NS-LTI/GT.

And the gifted children we advocated for years ago? All grown, many now parents themselves, with the same questions about their own bright children that we had about them a decade or two before. “Transition”, we call it, or some other innocuous term that reminds us that the sands of time ever flow, both within and around us.

Personally, and as much as I’d like not to submit to this truth, I think I now qualify as one of the old-timers; one of those gifted child educators whose sands have begun shifting noticeably downward. Having been in this field of GCE for 23 years, I look around at my colleagues and note that while some resemble my grandparents, others could be my children! Yet despite these vast differences in age and experience, I find one commonality: the issues we deal with related to the care and feeding of gifted children transcend the decades, and the advice we give for helping to meet the emotional needs of gifted people sounds very much today as it did 30 years ago.

Does this sameness represent stability or stagnation? An interesting and intriguing question, and who better to answer it than some of the veterans of our field, the “legends in the looking glass”, whose view of gifted children and those who care about them is a long one, indeed. Let's begin the passage...

The Context

What began as an exciting writing project turned into a four-year saga that I came to call (affectionately, of course) “The Book From Hell”. It was a grand idea, I thought: write an introductory textbook for the field of GCE by using interviews and personal stories from those who made the field what it is today. But in looking back on the creation of Once upon a mind: The stories and scholars of gifted child education (Wadsworth, 2000), I find that this multi-year project actually took me on a tour of my “professional past,” as I got to know, either in person or through their more intimate writings, the people behind the theories and the educators whose contributions have impacted the gifted field for decades.

What was going through the minds of Paul Torrance, Lewis Terman, Leta Hollingworth and James Gallagher as they devised the ideas that, today, are common knowledge or respected practice? That was the focus of Once upon a mind, and it will be the focus here, too. And as you will read, many of their thoughts reflect the emotional aspects...
of growing up gifted, even if their overall work in GCE is in a variety of different directions.

From the Beginning

Whether or not you admire his work (and for a variety of reasons, many people do not), Lewis Terman was undoubtedly the spark that set the gifted movement on fire. His five-volume Genetic Studies of Genius is psychology’s quintessential longitudinal study of gifted kids growing up. Yet even before Volume 1 ever hit the presses, Terman penned his thoughts on what he termed “precocity and prematuration.” In a 1905 article, Terman showed his respect for childhood by reminding us of a truth that still eludes many today: childhood is not preparation for life, it is life itself. As he wrote a century ago:

Heroic effort is made to boost every child just as near to the top of the intellectual ladder as possible, and to do so in the shortest possible time. Meanwhile, the child’s own instincts and emotions, on which alone all volition is based, are allowed to wither away. No adjustment of clock wheels, however complicated and delicate, can avail if the mainspring is wrongly attached or altogether missing. (pp. 162-163)

School work is done too early and does not educate the child as a whole . . . To build up the intellect at the expense of the rest of mentality robs it of every element that enables it. (p. 163)

We must explore the child’s natural interests and take our cue from them. Until the awakening of altruism it will be useless to try to force upon his comprehension a religion whose keynote is love and sympathy. The child is, and ought to be, an egoist. (p. 165)

“Slow down,” Terman reminds us, and let the gifted child take full advantage of his or her youth and naivete before embarking on the serious world of school. Can you imagine Terman’s likely reaction to the administration of the TAAS to elementary school children! His final quote here presages his disillusionment: “We have lengthened the hours of school work and taken away largely the opportunity for physical development” (p 182).

. . . And emotional development, too, at least from the vantage point of Leta Hollingworth. Working as Terman’s contemporary in New York (Terman was at Stanford), Hollingworth wrote the first--and still, probably, the best--introductory text in our field, Gifted children: Their nature and nurture (1926). As is true for many of us, she fell upon the gifted field by happenstance, not design. It began with her testing of “Child E,” an 8 year-old boy she was testing in front of one of her college classes. He scored an IQ of 187 on the Binet-Simon Scale. Hollingworth’s reaction?:

“I had tested thousands of incompetent persons . . . scarcely ever finding anyone with an IQ rating as high as 100. This thoroughgoing experience of the negative aspects of intelligence rendered the performance of E even more impressive to me than it would otherwise have been. I perceived the clear and flawless working of his mind against a contrasting background of thousands of dull and foolish minds. It was an unforgettable experience.”  (Hollingworth, 1942, p. x)

This initial exposure to a gifted child transformed Hollingworth’s life--how many of us know this same feeling due to a gifted youngster we have met?--and her career focus. But unlike Terman, who concentrated more on the intellectual aspects of being gifted, Hollingworth focused on the social and emotional needs of these brilliant young people, for whom she served as their teacher at a public school in New York City. First, though, she wanted us to know why we need to educate gifted children differently than others:

Schools cannot equalize children, schools can only equalize opportunity. . . It is hard for a psychologist to define democracy, but perhaps one acceptable definition might be that it is a condition of affairs, in which every human being has opportunity to live and work in accordance with inborn capacity for achievement. (Hollingworth, 1922, p. 298)

Excerpting a career as extensive as Hollingworth’s is always a tricky proposition, but Linda Silverman, who has respected Hollingworth’s work for decades, extracted eleven key concerns that identify Hollingworth’s major contributions on the “emotional education” of gifted children, including:

• finding enough hard and interesting work at school
• adjusting to classmates
• being able to play with other children
• not becoming hermits
• developing leadership abilities
• not becoming negativistic towards authority
• learning to “suffer fools gladly”
• avoiding the formation of habits of extreme chicanery
• conforming to rules and expectations
• understanding their origin and destiny from an early age
• dealing with the special problems of being a gifted girl

(Silverman, 1990, p. 172)

(see DELISLE, page 13)
Specialized Counseling: The Social-Emotional Needs of Gifted Adolescents

Julianne Jacob Ryan

Although there are numerous conflicting opinions of what makes a child “gifted,” there is no arguing that gifted children have unique social and emotional needs. “Clinical sources suggest that talented children are subject to unique stressors and are vulnerable to difficulties with social/emotional adjustment” (Genshaft, Greenbaum, & Borovsky, 1995; Hoge & Renzulli, 1991; Hollinger, 1995; Silverman, 1993a, 1994; Webb, Meckstroth, & Tolan, 1982 cited in Moon, Kelly & Feldhusen, 1997, p.17).

Gifted children often have a similar “collection of problems,” first identified by Barbara Clark (1983). These individuals are different, and they know it. They are often smarter than their “age” peers, and interested in Shakespeare and quadratic equations while other students are myopically focused on dating, looks, and other superficial issues. Unfortunately, for many teens this difference is viewed not as an asset, but something to be ashamed of, something to hide. Not all gifted individuals are outcasts; some may be prom queens and quarterbacks, but looked at carefully, many of the same “collection of problems” appear.

James Webb, past director of SENG (Social and Emotional Needs of the Gifted), notes that “the gifted child frequently begins to feel different, alienated, and alone in a world of differing views and values” (Webb, 1982, p.24). Gifted adolescents (and sometimes adults) often perceive the world, its problems and injustices with more deliberation and insight than others.

There are many other common problems that Clark (1983) notes. Gifted kids tend to be more emotionally sensitive to their own feelings, as well as the feelings of others, than most members of society. They feel psychological pain and suffering at a heightened level. They may have advanced levels of morality, along with an impassioned sense of idealism. Other shared traits include perfectionism, a sharp sense of humor, emotional, psychological and intellectual intensity, supersensitivities, avid curiosity, flight of ideas, high standards and expectations of both self and others, insight above their years, a heightened sense of self-concept, and often a lack of concrete direction. Sadly, this “collection of problems” often results in gifted teens being “…plagued by feelings of sadness, anger, depression and anxiety. She [he] may wonder if life is worth living in a world in which she [he] so clearly does not fit” (Webb, 1982, p.25). Jim Webb described gifted individuals as being “emotionally intense with an extra emotional antennae.”

Just as their thought processes are complex, so are their emotions. Linda Silverman, a prominent specialist in the field of the gifted and talented, notes:

The intricate thought processes that mark these individuals as gifted are mirrored in the intricacy of their emotional development. Idealism, self-doubt, perceptiveness, excruciating sensitivity, moral imperatives, desperate needs for understanding, acceptance, love — all impinge simultaneously. Their vast emotional range make them appear contradictory: mature and immature, arrogant and compassionate, aggressive and timid. Semblances of composure and self-assurance often mask deep feelings of
insecurity. The inner experience of the gifted . . . is rich, complex and turbulent. (1993, p.84)

Dabrowski (1972), in building his concept of developmental potential, discovered that “creatively gifted individuals had more pronounced responses to various types of stimuli.” These responses, known as “overexcitabilities,” are often used in describing experiences found in the gifted population. The five overexcitabilities (OEs) are psychomotor, sensual, imaginational, intellectual, and emotional which can be thought of as “…an abundance of physical energy, heightened acuity of the senses, vivid imagination, intellectual curiosity and drive, and a deep capacity to care” (Silverman, 1994, p.110).

**Psychomotor overexcitability** manifests itself in a heightened surplus of energy. These are often the kids diagnosed today as ADHD, and there are numerous children dual diagnosed as ADHD and gifted, or behavior disordered and gifted. Traits include rapid speech, marked excitement, compulsive speech, and a great need for action and movement. They live in a very physical, active realm. Psychomotor activities provide the expression for their emotional intensity.

**Sensual overexcitabilities** are typified by the heightened experiences of sensual pleasures or displeasure, an intense sexuality, and high appreciation for aesthetic beauty, including words, music, and color.

Individuals with **imaginational overexcitability** are characterized by a heightened imagination, along with a rich association of real and imagined images and impressions. They have a great ability to invent and fantasize, and may have a rich fantasy world. These people use spontaneous imagery as a coping skill, such as a constant mixing of truth and fiction when their world is off-balance.

**Intellectual overexcitability** is described as a heightened need to seek understanding and truth, to gain and analyze knowledge. Also included is a persistent questioning nature; such as the child who wants to unlock all of the universe’s secrets. These individuals may be preoccupied with logical and moral inquiries, way beyond their years. These children are prone to making insightful, but inappropriate remarks.

A person with **emotional overexcitability** is typified by having heightened, intense positive and negative feelings, somatic expressions, strong affective expressions, the capacity for strong attachments and deep relationships, and a well-differentiated feeling of self (Dabrowski). This individual may experience the world in extremes of highs and lows, akin to bipolar disorder. Life experiences may be equal parts beauty and trauma.

“Most significantly, their emotional lives are richly complex and intense [being] flooded by unexpected waves of joy; feeling incredibly alive; and experiencing even the greatest pain [as] ecstatic and full of life” (Piechowski, 1991 cited in Grant, 1995, p.133).

All five can be areas of both problems and strengths. For example, an individual who experiences emotional excitabilities may be a compassionate, understanding, genuine human being, who has a strong desire to help others. Along with this desire comes an overly intense identification with others’ problems and feelings, which can be destructive, if the individual does not have the capacity to separate from others. It is important for parents and teachers to be familiar with each of these categories, as they are often seen in the home and classroom.

Fitting into the world of peer relationships can be especially troublesome for gifted youths. Their interests, hobbies, and intellectual capabilities are in many ways more sophisticated than those of their age peers. These children often have little to no interest in many typical childhood pursuits, preferring instead to satisfy their own desires for knowledge and exploration (Webb, 1982, p.26). However, they still have the physical play needs of any child. Therefore, gifted children and adolescents need a variety of peers for their various intellectual, athletic, and emotional developments.

The need for a variety of peer groups stems from the fact that gifted children often share the trait of asynchronous development in which, “…advanced cognitive abilities and heightened intensity combine to create inner experiences and awareness that are qualitatively different from the norm” (The Columbus group, 1991 cited in Silverman, 1994, p.113). In the gifted, this means their cognitive, emotional, and physical developments are uneven, and out of sync with each other.

This asynchronous development leads to much confusion for both the child and the family. Many adults forget that the gifted child’s emotional and intellectual developments are rarely at the same levels (Webb, 1982, p.16). The child is expected to act with an intelligence equal to his maturity level, not his age, and this synchronicity in behavior will not automatically occur. A ten year old with the intelligence and cognitive thought process of an adult, is still a child. These children may engage in a seemingly bizarre stream of actions, appearing mature and worldly one day, and childish the next (Webb, 1982, p.16).

Asynchronisity can create strife for the individual as well. Advanced cognition often makes the child aware of information that she can understand intellectually, but not emotionally. Children may have great ideas, which at age five, their hands may not be able to produce. This uneven development can lead to frustration, anger and depression; therefore, parents and helpers need to be aware of these developmental differences, in order to adequately understand

(see RYAN, page 17)
T
here exists an urgent need to determine an educational plan which would facilitate highly capable students from the U.S. in fulfilling their academic potential. Coleman and Gallagher (1995) delineated twelve best practices for providing appropriate differentiated services for gifted students. One of the practices states, “Children who are gifted form a diverse group with a variety of needs and, therefore, require a range of service options. To serve the needs of secondary gifted students, a cadre of service delivery models are utilized across the United States. Strategies to serve students include:

- Enrichment in the classroom
- Consultant teacher model
- Resource program
- Community mentor
- Independent study program
- Special class
- Special schools”

About fifty percent of gifted secondary students are served in special classes where students are grouped together for the majority of class time and instructed by specially trained teachers (Gallagher, 1985). Gifted students are a heterogeneous group. Characteristics that might vary among gifted students are self-concept, extracurricular activities, specific academic interests and various levels of self-sufficiency. Coleman and Fults (1982) found that special programming for gifted elementary students had a negative effect on self-concept. However, some methodological flaws exist in the study. While the experimental group had a mean IQ of 136.28 the control group had a mean IQ of 118.18. Sayler and Brookshire (1993) compared the global self-concept of typical eighth grade students, accelerated eighth grade students, and eighth grade students placed in a program for the gifted. The global self-concept of both the gifted and accelerated groups were higher than those of the regular group. Manor-Bullock and Look (1995) reported that students who leave their high schools to attend special academic programs for the gifted may have left the high school setting because they felt uncomfortable and different from their peers.

In 1998, the Third International Mathematics and Science Study (TIMSS) compared a sample of the twelfth grade science and mathematics students in the United States to students in other countries. The U.S. students scored significantly below the international average on standardized tests at the twelfth grade level. Earlier TIMSS results showed that the achievement of U.S. fourth grade students was quite high, above the international average in both mathematics and science. In the middle grades, U.S. students began to lag behind and by eighth grade U.S. students score only slightly above the international average in science and below the international average in math. Advanced U.S. students fared no better than their average classmates. U.S. advanced math and physics students’ performance were among the lowest of the TIMSS nations.

Clearly, an urgent need exists for developing U.S. talent in the math and sciences areas. Our most talented young
people are performing far below their expected potential. The scholarship, inventiveness, and expertise that created the foundation for America’s high standard of living and quality of life appear to be in question. Top U.S. students are less prepared to enter the work force or post-secondary education (U.S. Department of Education, 1998). Factors cited in the TIMMS, which contribute to the lack of preparation, include: a less rigorous curriculum, less homework and the lack of reading of demanding books. Commenting on the demise of the U.S. excellence in education, Desmond (1994) states, “Fueled by the indifference of the American people to the needs of children with special talents and buffeted by a failure of our schools to meet, much less, exceed international academic standards, a rising tide of mediocrity has begun to swamp our nation and extinguish the sparks of genius that have made America great.”

Do different characteristics personify students who elect participation in a specific service delivery model? The current study seeks to determine if a “best” service delivery model can meet the needs of all gifted students or if certain student characteristics lend themselves to successful participation in a specific model, such as early college entrance.

METHOD

Participants

As they exited their senior year in high school, 78 academically talented students were studied to determine the relationship between early college admission, self-concept and academic aptitude. It was hypothesized that students who elected to enter college early did so because of differences in programming needs. All student participants resided in four southern states. Each participant had been identified and placed in gifted programs prior to fifth grade.

Service Delivery Models

The students represented three service delivery models available for academically talented students. Twenty-eight students participated in an early college admissions program. Rather than remaining in the high school setting, these students had been accepted and participated in one of two residential programs designed to allow gifted students to enter college one to two years early. The early admission students resided in special residence halls and participated in college courses with typical college students. Student participants could register for any courses in the university’s core curriculum of courses for college freshmen and sophomores. Students participating in the program were given a special waiver so that college level courses could meet graduation requirements at the high school level. Each student in the program graduated from high school while attending college.

Twenty-eight of the student participants were served in a two-year program in high school with a differentiated curriculum for academically talented students. Students labeled academically talented could elect to participate in the differentiated curriculum or continue with regular high school courses. The differentiated curriculum students had participated in an integrated subject program where the curriculum was organized to reinforce similar concepts in math and science. Before each unit of instruction, students were pre-tested to determine knowledge of subject. Curriculum compacting was utilized to allow students to cover more information in shorter periods of time. Students met together for a two hour and forty-five minute block of time daily. The block period was equivalent to a math, science and lunch period. Blocking allowed students more time to participate in laboratory and field experiences. Because of curriculum compacting and the blocking schedule, students were able to complete more course work in areas such as calculus, physics, biology and discriminate math. The third group of students (n=28) remained in the regular high school setting. For academic course work, students typically enrolled in honors or advanced placement courses with other college bound students. No differentiated curriculum was available for the contrast group.

Instruments

As they exited their senior year in high school all students completed the Scholastic Aptitude Test (SAT) and the Dimensions of Self-Concept (DOSC). The SAT is a commonly administered college entrance exam, which assesses academic aptitude. The DOSC is a self-report inventory of

(see TYLER-WOOD & CERELIO, page 20)
Perfectionism vs. Compulsive Behavior

We often talk about gifted children's perfectionism, but little has been said about when striving and anxiety is no longer perfectionism but Obsessive Compulsive Disorder (OCD). OCD is an anxiety disorder that has been nicknamed the "doubting disease" because people who have it have difficulty knowing things with any certainty. The disorder is characterized by obsessions and/or compulsions (most sufferers have both) that cause significant distress to an individual and take up more than an hour a day of a person's time or significantly interfere with the person's social or academic functioning or routine.

An obsession is a recurring thought the individual feels she cannot shake. Common obsessions include extreme concern for symmetry or order, excessive concern that an assignment has been done incorrectly, and fear that something bad is going to happen. In an effort to reduce the anxiety aroused by the obsession, most people with OCD engage in repetitive behaviors called compulsions, the most common of which are checking, washing, and counting.

Obsessions and compulsions, like all behaviors, fall along a continuum from not at all to all the time. Many of us make jokes about our own compulsive behaviors, but our compulsions are not distressing to us, nor do they take up inordinate amounts of time. Epidemiological studies estimate the prevalence of OCD to be about 2-3% in the population. Onset is usually gradual and often begins in adolescence.

A gifted student who has a checking compulsion may take longer and longer to complete schoolwork. Perhaps she insists on going over her work again and again, looking for errors. She continues to have doubts that it is not correct enough, (the obsession), so she checks it again. Her anxiety escalates as she begins to obsess that she's going to fail the class if the assignment is not perfect, and her subsequent checking and rechecking can become so time-consuming that she fails to turn her work in and falls behind. Her parents may be upset because she is spending so many hours on homework, and is not getting to bed on time.

Two treatments are effective for OCD: drug therapy and behavior therapy. One or the other helps many people, and many people choose to do a combination of the two. Medication does not cure OCD, but does often reduce the symptoms so that people feel more in control of their obsessions and compulsions. Medication also reduces the anxiety that accompanies the disturbing thoughts. Anafranil, Luvox, Prozac, and Zoloft are some of the drugs used to treat OCD.

Behavior therapy teaches people ways to reduce their anxiety and compulsions. Behavioral treatment includes exposing the person to the things she is afraid of and having her delay her usual response to her anxiety (exposure response prevention). Children learn to gradually increase this delay time. It is a very effective treatment. Initially, people may find the idea of behavior therapy frightening, but the success they experience with practice tends to override their initial fears. Many people see noticeable improve-

________ . . . where do true disorders begin and where do habits, style, or propensities lie on the continuum?

ment in their symptoms after two to three months of behavior therapy and the benefits tend to last for years.

What Can Teachers Do?

Teachers can aware of the indicators of OCD and refer students they are concerned about. Teachers can also be familiar with common strategies for dealing with these problem behaviors and encourage OCD students to practice the strategies they are learning. For example, teachers, like families, need to learn to not participate in the OCD child's rituals, nor to support the child in avoiding the things that he or she finds anxiety-provoking.

High Energy, Drive, and Attention Deficit Hyperactivity Disorder

ADHD is a developmental disorder characterized by problems with inhibition and inattention. Most children with the disorder have difficulties with self-regulation. They are impulsive and inattentive. Some are only impulsive. In other words, ADHD is a disorder of self-control. It is persistent, pervasive, and dimensional and evident by about age four.
There is no such thing as late onset ADHD. ADHD is a matter of degree, and that is why there is so much disagreement among professionals regarding the diagnosis. The determination of how much impulsivity and inattention is required to make a diagnosis is a matter of subjective clinical judgment. To further complicate matters, the symptoms of ADHD are also characteristic of other problems. The creatively talented student who is not challenged in the classroom may be more disruptive than a teacher is willing to accommodate or tolerate and be viewed as having an attention deficit. Anxious or oppositional children can also look like ADHD students so when there is a question, it is essential that the child be evaluated thoroughly by someone who is trained in differential diagnosis and who has some awareness of how instructional practices can affect motivation and behavior. Prevalence, then, is dependent on one's viewpoint, but epidemiological studies put it at about 5%. There is wide agreement among professionals that the disorder is overdiagnosed. Unfortunately, where to draw the line is going to vary considerably.

Why is there so much concern about ADHD? The disorder is quite serious, and is strongly correlated with other negative developmental outcomes when left untreated. For instance, ADHD is associated with conduct disorders, substance abuse, severe depression, and promiscuity. ADHD children have a high school failure rate that is four times that of children without the disorder. Studies estimate that anywhere from 15-30% of untreated ADHD children develop criminal behaviors as adults.

There is considerable consensus among mental health professionals that a child diagnosed with ADHD should be taking medication. Consensus is so strong on this issue that some consider it to be grounds for malpractice if a clinician does not recommend medication for ADHD. The reason for this stress on medication as a first line of treatment is because studies indicate medication is the most effective treatment, and because the risks for developing additional serious problems are so high without it. When the diagnosis is certain medication should come first, then other training.

Empirically proven treatments for ADHD include psychoeducational counseling to parents and teenagers, teacher training about classroom management, parent training in child management, parent support groups, social skills training when it is embedded in the natural environment, and problem solving and communication training. About 40% of ADHD children will also need some formal special education services.

Differentiation of ADHD from other problems is not the domain of most school personnel. Someone with training and experience in child development and psychopathology should make the diagnosis. Use of a broad band rating scale and an ADHD rating scale may be useful in differentiating ADHD from depression and anxiety. Psychological tests are not useful for differential diagnosis, but a thorough parent interview is crucial. It is especially important to review both parents' family psychiatric history. Although teens tend to grossly underreport their ADHD symptoms, they are quite reliable about symptoms of anxiety and depression.

What Can Teachers Do?
A helpful rule of thumb is to reduce the child's age by 30% in your mind and consider them to have that level of self-control. Blind trials of medication can be very helpful when there is concern or hesitation about treating the disorder with medication. In a blind trial a pharmacist makes up placebo pills along with the medication. There is usually about a ten-day trial of each, and an assessment is made at the end of each ten days regarding the child's attention and impulse control. No one but the pharmacist knows when the child is taking the placebo and when the child is taking the stimulant medication. This way there is less bias about the effectiveness or ineffectiveness of the medication. Such trials can sometimes convince hesitant parents or students that medication is helpful, or convince overzealous teachers that medication is not the panacea.

The teacher of the gifted student with ADHD should also be aware that some of the instructional accommodations recommended for ADHD students may be contraindicated for gifted students. For example, the suggestion to provide more frequent but shorter work periods may not be welcomed by the gifted child. Gifted students tend to want time to immerse themselves in activities of interest and may be more frustrated by shortened work periods. Table 1 lists several accommodations that are helpful to students with ADHD.

Intensity, Sensitivity and Introversion
Asperger's Syndrome (AS) is a pervasive developmental disorder characterized by severe impairment in social interaction and restricted patterns of behaviors and interests. It is one of the autism spectrum disorders, but it is different from autism in that it has a later onset, and there is no significant delay in language, cognitive development, adaptive behavior other than social, age appropriate self-help skills, or curiosity about the environment. Aspergers is the "hot" new diagnosis. Prevalence was once believed to be quite rare, but clinical studies are now suggesting that it may run as high as .2-.3% in the general population. The
The syndrome is believed to last throughout a person's lifetime. There are many similarities between the gifted child with Asperger's Syndrome and the highly gifted child, so how can you tell which is which? Both tend to be highly verbal, with an early interest in words or numbers. Hypersensitivity and intensity are common, though not universal, and both may manifest emotional reactions (particularly anxiety or aggression) that seem out of proportion to events. Distinguishing normal giftedness from giftedness with Asperger's is not too difficult, however, once one knows what to look for.

Although both normal and AS gifted children can be very verbal, the latter tend to be pedantic in their speech. Both can express very fluent speech, but the speech of the AS child tends to be seamless, running on and on, mixing personal accounts with factual information. Observers will also quickly note the absence of or inappropriate affect of

- Use lower accuracy quotas that increase overtime with child's success
- Eliminate high appeal distracters
- Allow some restlessness at work area
- Be animated, theatrical, and responsive
- Invite the students to teach with you
- Don't reinforce speed of response (that reinforces impulsivity)
- Reinforce thoughtful, think aloud approach
- Minimize lecture
- Put more difficult subjects in the morning
- Allow untimed tests
- Have a hierarchy of negative consequences for misbehaviors
- Don't expect such students to motivate themselves.
- Be willing to use a token economy system of reinforcement with younger students.

**Table 1**

the Asperger child. This is not a characteristic of gifted children. Gifted children are not nearly as rigid about routines as some AS children are either, and are not as likely to become as aggressive or anxious when routines are disrupted. Perhaps the single most distinguishing characteristic is the AS child's inability to understand and appreciate others' viewpoints. Gifted children without the disorder are generally aware of their idiosyncrasies and understand that others will see them as odd. The AS child is oblivious.

Treatment for Asperger's Syndrome focuses on information and support, and managing or accommodating symptoms. The most important step in treatment is diagnosis and securing appropriate educational services. Sensory Integration Therapy can be very helpful in reducing hypersensitivity to sensory stimuli (e.g. tactile defensiveness). This therapy is provided by a licensed occupational therapist. The tendency of AS individuals to adhere to rigid rules and routines may be helpful in establishing patterns of adaptive behaviors. Social and communication skills are best taught in a group setting through repetition, social stories, and mirroring. Medications may be helpful to treat specific symptoms such as aggression, compulsions, or anxiety.

The use of visual supports, either with pictograms or written words, can be extremely beneficial in helping the child to sequence behaviors so he or she can manage in the classroom. Visual supports include icons, pictograms, or words that are sequenced to visually represent an activity, behavioral expectations, or a routine. For instance, a gifted high school student with Asperger's Syndrome may find it helpful to carry a bookmark that visually depicts what the sequence is once s/he leaves a class and heads to another. Or, a junior high AS student who is taking an accelerated class where a lot of social interaction is required may benefit from a visual support that reminds him or

AS individuals are such strong visual thinkers that they may need to see it to be able to do it. Visual supports help AS students manage their anxiety because the cues help them to anticipate what's next. Younger gifted AS students should probably always have some visual supports available to them. School personnel may be amazed by the dramatic improvement that quickly results in a gifted, AS child's behavior when visual supports are added.

To be most effective in supporting the positive adjustment of gifted children it is helpful to dialogue across and within disciplines. All of us together are more knowledgeable than any single one of us. We may not always agree,
but the dialogue increases our understanding, expands our perspectives, and builds our skills to help the children we care about. Readers interested in obtaining more detailed information about the conditions mentioned here may wish to consult the following recommended resources:

OCD Foundation
PO Box 9573
New Haven, CT 06535
(203) 772-0565

The National Attention Deficit Disorder Association
9930 Johnnycake Ridge Road, Suite 3E
Mentor, OH 44060
(440) 350-0223

Internet sources:
www.NIMH.NIH.Gov/Publicat/OCD.HTM
www.NIMH.NIH.Gov/Publicat/ADHD.CFM
www.NINDS.NIH.Gov/patients/disorder/asperger
www.asperger.org
www.OCFoundation.org
www.add.org
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It takes only a quick glance to realize that the issues above are faced as frequently today by gifted children (and their parents) as they were back when Hollingworth first identified them. This commonality was not lost on Silverman, who wrote in 1990 that “gifted children need exactly the kind of curriculum, programming and appreciation for their social and emotional development that Leta Hollingworth provided almost 70 years ago.”

What will it take for us to act upon the wisdom that is so apparent in these words? Fifty years from now, the issues will be very similar, but will the desire to address them be any more focused than today? A good question, indeed.

The Soulmate Search: Giftedness as a Social Liability.

Some people assume I’m conceited and untouchable, or impossible to get along with. They’ve heard of me but they don’t know me in person. They’ve read the reviews and think they’ve read the book. (American Association for Gifted Children, 1978, p. 20)

I often wonder why stereotypes exist about gifted children. On a part-time basis, I teach gifted students in grades 7-8, 36 students per class. I dare anyone to come up with an image, a stereotype, that fits even half of these kids. Some are among the school’s best athletes while others win awards for all manner of academic events. Some win both. Most have friends both inside and outside our class, while a few are fairly isolated from the social milieu that is a typical aspect of junior high school. In other words, they mirror our school’s population as they mirror our town’s population: a human goulash of personalities, minds and attitudes. How does one get pigeonholed within such diversity?

Abraham Tannenbaum (whose brilliant 1983 book, Gifted children: Psychological and educational perspectives, rivals Hollingworth’s in excellence) wondered this same thing when, back in 1962, he described eight imaginary high school students in short, three-sentence descriptions. Each description included information on the student’s academic ability (brilliant or average), school effort (studious or a slacker) and sports’ abilities (athletic versus non-athletic). Then, Tannenbaum asked 615 eleventh graders to rate these classmates on 54 character traits, asking, in effect, “Would you want this person to be your friend?”

The results? No surprise. The most socially accepted student was the brilliant, non-studious athlete, the kid who “had it all” but didn’t appear to need to work at it. The least acceptable student was the brilliant, studious non-athlete, which led me to conclude that “a gifted student who
studies—which is, of course, the societal stereotype of the gifted nerd—is a social leper, removed from acceptance in an adolescent context in which taking pride in one’s achievement is risky business.” (Delisle, 2000, p. 51)

It’s been almost forty years since Tannenbaum did his classic study. Have we come any closer to an accurate, social interpretation of gifted children; one that downplays self-esteem issues? My guess is that we have been somewhat successful in this realm, as the current push for academic performance in our nation’s schools has reached a crescendo through high-stakes testing. These days, in many schools, it is cool to be an achiever. But, at the same time, when the media portray gifted classes as a holding tank for misfits (as on Fox’s Malcolm in the Middle), one has to wonder if the entertainment value of smart kids acting stupid is just too lucrative for the media to abandon.

As an American culture, we have always been suspect of those whose light seems to shine too brightly, as if the intellect of the gifted few causes a poor reflection on the non-gifted many. Of all the issues that gifted child advocates need to confront in the years ahead, I believe this social aspect of growing up gifted in a society that is ambivalent towards intellectual brilliance is of paramount concern. The reasons for this in terms of gifted children’s self-esteem is obvious but, as explained in the next section, it has academic implications as well.

Underachieving to Survive: The Gifted Child at Risk

“I like him, mom. He doesn’t want to fix me.”

—Jacob, age 14

There are few subspecialties in GCE that have garnered as much attention over the generations as the topic of underachievement. Unfortunately, some of the worst research and advice to be found in our field exists within this area. In fact, more than a generation ago, Raph and Tannenbaum (1961) analyzed more than 90 studies on underachievement and came to this conclusion: the studies’ results were so varied and contradictory, that there was no way to say definitively what worked and what didn’t. I would predict that a similar study done over the last 30 years of research on underachievement would yield the same inclusive findings. Why? Read on . . .

The brief quote that begins this section came from one of my former students, then in eighth grade. I met with Jacob once weekly, for 30 minutes, when the school counselor thought it might do Jacob some good to connect with someone on a one-to-one basis. Jacob’s grades ranged from “B” to “F,” his seventh grade GPA was 1.6, and by his own admission he hung out with the “wrong” kind of kids. He did this because, as he later told me, “Since everyone puts them down for being who they are, I thought we had something in common.”

When Jacob and I met, we just talked. Correct that: initially, I just talked! Why should Jacob, an adolescent who had been told for years that we “wasn’t working up to his potential” trust another adult stranger with too many graduate degrees? He’d seen my kind before, no doubt; well-intentioned others who tried to convince him that he could do better in school if he only made some effort.

During our first meeting, I relayed a few messages to Jacob:

1. I wouldn’t meet with him if he didn’t want to meet, but . . .
2. If he did agree to meet with me and he forgot to show up, I would have his permission to find him in his study hall. (This could risk embarrassment from his friends, I thought, which is why I wanted his permission to do so.)
3. Neither he nor I would prepare anything in advance to talk about during our meetings. If all else failed, we would play poker.
4. If he thought it would be a good idea to intervene on his behalf with a teacher, I would do so. If I thought it would be a good idea to do the same, I would do so.
5. I wasn’t meeting with Jacob to try to get him to do anything he really didn’t want to do. I was meeting with him because his school counselor thought we would get along well. If Jacob’s grades or attitude about school improved, that would be a bonus.
6. He could e-mail me anytime between our meetings if he had something to say. I would do the same with him.

Our meetings took place over the course of just one year, the same year Jacob was enrolled in my 8th grade program for gifted students. Early on, our conversations were about nothing in particular—his favorite video games or TV shows. Later, he spoke more of his two dads, his doting mom, and his two sisters, one 16 years old and the other 11 months. When he was out of school for ten days, and then returned looking ragged and tired, he told me of his grandfather’s death and how he had to move in with his grandmother for a while because she hadn’t lived alone for years, and she was scared. “I didn’t mind helping her out,” he said, realizing that his role of grandson had expanded way beyond what it had been before.

One day he announced that he was cutting his shoulder-length hair and buying some clothes that were not too big. I asked why.

“Because I’m tired of being followed around by security guards every time I walk into Wal-Mart. I guess I look
like I'm going to steal something."

"How will your friends react to your new look?" I asked.

Jacob shrugged, and without even a semblance of humor or sorrow, told me bluntly: "They've been one of my biggest problems for years. It's time to move on."

... Which he did, literally and figuratively. Now a 10th grader in another school system, Jacob still keeps in touch and sends me pictures of himself through e-mail to "prove that he still looks clean." He ended 8th grade with only one low grade, a "D" in math, but since it was in a challenging class and not the "dummy class" (his words) that he had been enrolled in initially, he took solace in this.

"I don't mind as much doing bad in a hard class," he said. I agreed with him that there was some comfort to be taken in a "hard math 'D'".

On our last meeting of the year, I picked up the never-used deck of cards that I had always brought along. Proudly, I said to Jacob, "Do you realize we always had enough to talk about that we never even took these out?"

And then, the grin: "That's 'cause I didn't know how to play poker so I always made up something to say!" Jacob laughed. So did I.

Did I try to "fix" Jacob? I certainly hope not, as he was perfectly all right as he was. What he needed was understanding and affirmation, not coercive contracts or grade-dependent consequences, the supposed antidotes for underachievement. Jacob knew what he was capable of doing, and he was more aware of his knowledge gaps than anyone else. If instead of just talking I assumed the role of tutor or teacher (he'd had plenty of both), I can't imagine that Jacob would have opened up as he did about his friends, or dab his eyes unashamedly whenever he mentioned his grandparents, or giggle like a toddler when he spoke of the joy that his baby sister brought into his family's life.

I present this extended scenario of Jacob because just about everything I did with him goes against most of the advice parents and educators receive about reversing the pattern of underachievement, that is, to reward good behavior and grades, to require certain levels of performance to earn desired privileges, and to applaud efforts to fit into systems of rules and schools that may, in fact, actually be promoting the underachievement. Indeed, in an especially egregious case of disrespect for the individual, Rimm (1995) describes cases of underachievement through one-dimensional caricatures that are alarming. "Passive Paul," "Manipulative Mary," "Depressed Donna," and "Dramatic Dick" are among the sixteen "prototypes" of underachievers, each one a fictional dramatization, a parody of the real thing: a gifted child who is not achieving for reasons that are complex and varied. This is just one example of some of the shameful and negative depictions of underachievers seen in the literature on this topic. With rare exception, almost nowhere in the research on gifted underachievers is there a hint of possibility that the child who chooses to underachieve does so as a sign of survival, not rebellion.

Only in 1980 did a study focus on underachievers as individuals, not subjects; as learners, not losers. It is a crime of omission that this study, and its premise and methods, has not been replicated dozens of times.

The work, of course, is by Joanne Whitmore, as reported in her groundbreaking book, Giftedness, conflict and underachievement (1980). In it, Whitmore reports on a multi-year intervention she employed as a classroom teacher serving highly gifted, low achieving primary school students. Through the implementation of a hands-on curriculum that focused more on concepts than worksheets, undergirded by a structure based on respectful acceptance of even aberrant behaviors, Whitmore found that her students began to succeed as students. More importantly, they began to see themselves as worthwhile people.

More than 25 years after leaving her classroom, Joanne Whitmore reflected on why her program was so successful. Here are her remarks:

1. All children, including the gifted, want to achieve success in school—academically and socially.
2. None of my children manifested low self-esteem and patterns of underachievement before entering school; their underachievement was content-specific.
3. Classroom conditions, social and academic in nature, had taught my children that non-engagement was safer and more rewarding than engagement. Appropriate classroom conditions with peers, curriculum and instructional approaches can reverse even the most severe patterns of underachievement in young children.

(Delisle, 2000, p. 73)

In more recent years, some isolated studies of underachievement (Baum, 1990; Emerick, 1992) have looked at this phenomenon from a positive, non-judgmental basis, but if one wishes to benefit from the best research ever done on this complex topic, it is best to stick with the original: Giftedness, conflict and underachievement.

If he were here, Jacob would thank you.

In Conclusion: A Tribute To Our Forebears

The area of social and emotional development of gifted youth has concerned educators, parents and psychologists since the beginning of our field. In one way or another, despite our many differences in viewpoints regarding how best to challenge the minds of gifted students, there is an
underlying, and sometimes, unstated, concern for their happiness and well-being as people.

To conclude this article, I thought I would condense some of the good thinking that has come forth from our forebears, those legends in the looking glass whose words and presence continue to permeate our field, whether or not they are still alive to share it with us. From Once upon a mind, then, I present a few of the best:

E. Paul Torrance, in 1995:
“(In 1968) I predicted that in the future we shall have to depend upon creatively gifted members of the disadvantaged and minority cultures for most of our creative achievements . . . Our creative achievers will be those who accept only those parts of the dominant culture that are true and hold to their individuality . . . It will be they who possess the different element, the divine discontent, and the clearness of vision to see when the king wears no clothes.” (p. 23)

J.P Guilford, in 1950:
“I am not opposed to the use of multiple-choice or other objectively-scorable tests in their proper places. What I am saying is that the quest for easily objectifiable testing and scoring has directed us away from the attempt to measure some of the most precious qualities of individuals and hence to ignore those qualities.” (p. 37)

John Feldhusen, in 1999:
“Tests are still good and helpful in the academic realm, but that is about all they are good for. If a teacher or parent or uncle or aunt or grandfather or whoever it is says, ‘Please give Donny a chance, I think he’s got something going’, we must never turn him away.” (p. 58)

Gina Ginsburg Riggs, in 1998:
“I have felt for a long time that if gifted education is to become legitimate and if gifted children are to be respected and liked, revered for what they can do to contribute to the quality of our lives, we have to sell their special needs and we have to ask the private sector to help us educate them.” (p. 108)

George Betts, in 1999:
“What I have learned is that a lot of times disenchanted kids don’t have a passion related to school, but they do have one out of school . . . If so, we should start out at the exploration level and investigate what they can learn about that passion that applies to school . . . For passion learning, I think one of the most important things a teacher can do is just get out of the way.” (p. 178)

Claude Brenner, a contestant on the TV show “Quiz Kids” in the 1950s:
“MIT was a chastening experience. When you came after having graduated first in your class, you discovered that everybody had graduated first in his class . . . I wanted to make it with a girl because I was charming and good-looking and debonair and dashing and persuasive and seductive, not because I was a Quiz Kid.” (p. 249)

Leta Hollingworth, in 1922:
“Should all children who test very high, as regards intellect, be educated for science, for the professions? . . . Should society induce some of them to join the manual trades, as hand workers? Should unskilled labor be drained by educational policy more thoroughly than it now is drained by competition, of all first-rate intelligence? These are disturbing questions of consequence, which affect the educator.” (p. 209)

Annemarie Roeper, in 1997:
“We seem to cut everything into smaller and smaller pieces. We never look at the whole, the soul, the mystery of the individual. We try to understand the child with the intellect, not with our empathy, our emotion. We judge, we evaluate. Feeling has a low priority. We have lost the vision. I feel we must reinstate the psyche to its proper place.” (p. 189)

Dorothy Sisk, in 1997, describing her first year as a teacher of gifted students:
“In those days, we had playground duty and I remember standing out on the field and Dale—who was probably my highest gifted kid; a brilliant, brilliant child—was way off by himself by the fence. So, I asked Ralph to go see what was wrong with Dale. As I watched him run over to Dale, and then return quickly, saying, ‘Dale’s OK—he’s just thinking.’ From that encounter I internalized the idea that gifted kids sometimes need to be alone. Sometimes they just need to think. Nobody taught me that—or, I guess Dale did.” (p. 148)

Alexinia Baldwin, in 1998:
“I started to school when I was four years old and entered high school at age eleven. I was pushed through and felt that I missed a lot. I got accelerated but didn’t get the kinds of in-depth knowledge I needed. I missed a lot, but teachers assumed that I would be able to accommodate.” (p. 46)
William G. Vassar, in 1998:
"I met with parents in a very affluent school district one night. One woman was talking about how everyone should be treated equally. I asked her if she had trash collectors in her town. She said, 'Oh, yes. And they are very good ones!' I said back to her, 'That's fine. Now, tell me the last time that you invited those trash collectors to your Christmas cocktail party.' Her face just fell. If you believe in heterogeneous grouping of students, that's fine. If you believe in homogeneous grouping, that's fine, too. But if you're trying to tell me that you're going to equalize education by putting everyone together in the same place, you're wrong." (p. 55)

James J. Gallagher, in 1997:
"When I was about six, I went to a special school for gifted kids run by the University of Pittsburgh... I didn't feel strange about going to a special school because all the kids were the same. The issue of being away from the neighborhood school was a problem, though. I didn't have as easy a social life as I might have because I was traveling on the streetcar all the time. But I was always interested in athletics. I played baseball, softball and football as often as I could, and sports gave me an entry into a social world." (p. 161)

The National Society for the Study of Education Yearbook, 1924 edition:
"The biggest question and the most difficult solution (in educating gifted students) is undoubtedly recognized as this: 'How shall their superior powers be challenged, and how shall curriculum and schoolroom procedure be modified to meet more fully the rightful demands of superior endowments?"" (p. 169)
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(from RYAN, page 7)

and provide the necessary help.

Adolescence is a time especially fraught with perils for this group, with the addition of conflicts between intellectual and peer group needs (Gross, 1989; Classen and Classen, 1995; as cited in Moon, Kelly and Fieldhusen, 1997, p.22) This is the time when these individuals may begin denying or hiding their talents. It is no longer "cool" to be smart. Fitting in with a peer group and belonging have become more important than intellectual and creative abilities. For gifted children, the price of acceptance can be quite high, as going along with the group usually means putting aside personal beliefs and values.

When discussing the needs of the gifted individual, it is important that strengths are not forgotten. Nearly every problem mentioned earlier has a flip side that can create a great strength. For example, the emotional makeup of gifted individuals that may cause them so much pain, may also
provide a strong sense of integrity and personal values. Many of these children survive crisis due in large part to a sense of humor and flexibility. They can both laugh at and bend with the world. They are often great problem-solvers, possessing an avid curiosity and tenacity. Other strengths encompass responsibility, cooperation, dedication, initiative and creativity.

It is essential that when looking at the gifted child, they are looked at as a whole, and both their strengths and weaknesses are considered. By focusing solely on the deficits and the problems, victims are created and the individual’s personal power is denied. The ability to turn problems into strengths is at the core of helping the gifted. Ultimately, “... the ability to achieve success... in their lives will most likely be determined by the decision to rely on their strengths rather than to surrender to the many problems which they will undoubtedly encounter as they mature” (Callahan, Cunningham & Plucker, 1994, p.104).

Adolescence is a vulnerable time for all teenagers, and gifted youths are no exception. There is a common misconception that gifted and talented youths have their worlds under complete control, suffer from few personal traumas, and do not need special attention, special education or special teachers who understand their emotional needs. However, the opposite is true. “Giftedness does not preclude the possibility that adolescents will experience serious emotional trauma” (Kline & Meckstroth, 1985 cited in Strip, Swassing & Kidder, 1991, p.124). It is important to note that although most children and adolescents encounter some strife growing up, “...[gifted] students can, however, experience emotional problems capable of ‘crippling the human spirit’” (Fergson, 1981; Schauer, 1976 cited in Strip, et al., 1991, p.124).

In order for gifted children to develop into healthy, fulfilled, actualized adults, there are certain needs that must be addressed, and teachers are in the perfect position to help address these needs. First and foremost, students should be assisted in discovering who they are, and in accepting and liking that self. They must understand and accept the ways in which they are similar to and the ways in which they are different from other people.

It is important that parents and professionals are aware of the special needs and strengths of this population. Without an adequate understanding of the gifted “experience”, the proper help cannot be offered. Although all children and adolescents share certain universal experiences and problems, the perspective and the social, emotional, academic, and guidance needs for the gifted are unique.
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(from BATSON, page 3) to work and struggle because we know that more will be expected from our young people as they enter the world of the 21st century, and we know that it is imperative that they all enter that world together with hope and opportunity.

We have made a special and successful effort in recent years in beginning to uplift our low-income youngsters, our minority youngsters and our special needs youngsters. These steps, which must indeed be accelerated, are crucial to building the kind of Texas we all want -- a state characterized by equity and excellence for all its citizens. The goal in a 1999 appropriations bill says it well: “The Texas Education Agency ("TEA") will build the capacity of the state public education system to ensure each student demonstrates exemplary performance in reading and the foundation subjects of English language arts, mathematics, science and social studies by developing and communicating standards of student achievement and district and campus accountability.”

While we have made progress toward that goal in the past 10 years, we still have so much to achieve. This paper addresses our specific shortcomings with respect to youngsters of all income levels and ethnicities who are either gifted learners or who are gifted and underachieving. Let us be clear: TAGT’s mission is to specifically advocate for gifted learners, not necessarily all high achievers, a much broader group. However, we believe that it makes strategic sense...
to align our goals with this broader group on some issues in order to achieve success. Gifted students stand to benefit significantly, as do all high achievers.

Data analysis completed by Just For The Kids reveals that 50% of grade 3-8 students who took the Texas Assessment of Academic Skills (TAAS) reading assessments in 1999 scored an 85 or above on the Texas Learning Index (TLI). This same data analysis reveals that more than 40% of these students scored a TLI of 85 or more on the TAAS mathematics assessments. Just for the Kids believes, and Texas Education Agency staff confirms, that scores above 85 are very unreliable indicators of learning proficiencies and deficiencies of students. A score above 85 would indeed indicate that a youngster is "doing well" and is "at grade level," but it would demonstrate neither the depth nor complexity of the student's academic mastery nor the academic level at which the student performs. For example, a third grader with a 90 TLI score in reading on the TAAS might be reading at the third grade level, or at the fourth grade level, or even at the fifth grade level. And there would be no item analysis to show which specific proficiencies the student has mastered in that wide range of possibilities.

In Texas, our robust accountability system operates on the basic principle that "what gets tested is what gets taught." And, so, the problem - simply stated - for youngsters who score above 85 on the TLI is that:

- a) we cannot diagnose academic needs,
- b) we do not have appropriate information about academic achievement, and
- c) therefore, we have no way of holding the system or key players in the system accountable for these students' achieving a year's growth (or any measure of growth) for a year in school. In fact, as well, there are no measures in the accountability system that would yield consequences dependent upon how well we educate these students.

This predicament is unfortunate for at least two reasons. We say we owe all children an exemplary education, and yet we are not structured to provide that education for gifted or advanced students. And, as we raise the bar and encourage more youngsters to go to college, we are failing to advance the very youngsters (of all income groups and ethnicities) who show the greatest promise of attending and succeeding in college and then becoming the innovators and scientists, the doctors and engineers, the poets and inventors who will lead our way into the future.

PLANNING OF ACTION
The Texas Association for the Gifted and Talented advocates the following measures to improve the education of our state's gifted children:

1. Set high standards with well-defined accountability measures for the education of gifted and talented students, K-12.

For the long term, the system ought to be equally accountable for advancing all children, including gifted children, at a pace that challenges them to meet their full potential.

In the short term, immediate steps should be taken:

- a) This Legislature should direct the Texas Education Agency, on a pilot basis, to offer alternative assessments that would show the extent to which youngsters scoring beyond 85 on the TLI are performing beyond grade level. The Texas Education Agency staff would be expected to consult with external assessment experts with experience in developing cross grade assessments; these external experts will assist in selecting alternative assessments;
- b) The Texas Education Agency should be appropriated modest funds to encourage a diverse range of schools to voluntarily participate in the pilot (mentioned above). These funds would support purchase and/or design plus implementation of the alternative assessments as well as effective professional development and other strategies that would help educators respond to the new data and lead to appropriate educational opportunities for gifted students;
- c) The Texas Education Agency should be directed to begin consideration, in conjunction with the pilot, of ways of measuring gains for youngsters with scores greater than 85 on the TLI and to implement such measures as a part of the accountability system over the next five years; and
- d) The Texas Education Agency should be funded an additional $1,000,000 (total $1.5 million) to continue and complete the work of Rider 69 to the 1999 Appropriations Bill to determine unique standards and accountability measures, particularly for gifted education, K-12. These standards and measures should be considered and incorporated into actions taken by the Texas Education Agency with respect to making sure that the accountability system addresses the needs of all gifted children within five years.

2. Expand the scope of the Texas reading initiative and any other new statewide initiatives to provide appropriate challenges for gifted students.

In particular, as part of the professional development of second grade teachers in 2001 and any further reading training funded by the 77th Legislature, meaningful training components should be developed and utilized to show teachers how to help advanced readers not only by expanding
their reading skills but also by developing their skills to locate, analyze, synthesize and evaluate information and derive meaning from print. With the current system, particularly in the early grades, the focus is on readers who are lagging behind. Readers who are functioning above grade level, sometimes significantly above grade level, are not challenged to achieve to their fullest potential. Appropriate reading materials also are needed, as these youngest children require access to materials generally reserved for children several grades ahead.

Commissioner Nelson has indicated, with support from the Governor’s office, that he intends to propose a mathematics initiative to the legislature that will primarily ready students in grades 4-8 to take and pass algebra. The goals set out in SB 103 and our state’s recommended and distinguished high school curricula call for proficiency well beyond Algebra 1. This initiative, therefore, should at least in small part, help teachers educate advanced youngsters in the affected grades so that they may be challenged to take on mathematics work that is appropriate for their ability.

3. Increase funding to provide appropriate educational services for gifted and talented students, K-12.

In the 76th Legislature, weighted funding was approved for 186,000 gifted students. However, there are approximately 330,000 identified gifted students. African Americans, Hispanics and low-income youngsters are inadequately identified and poorly served.

School districts across the state ought to be given incentives by the Legislature to identify and serve low-income and Hispanic, African American, and other gifted students of color by providing weighted funding above the 186,000 level for all gifted students of color and low-income gifted students who are newly identified and served. In 1998-99, more than 14% of all Texas public school students were African American yet just over 10% of identified gifted/talented students were African American. Almost 39% of all students were Hispanic but only 24% of identified gifted/talented students were Hispanic.

4. Require certification in gifted education for teachers of gifted students.

Gifted and talented students frequently have unique academic needs and different learning styles. In order for them to achieve at the levels that they are capable of reaching, they need teachers with specialized teaching skills, and they need access to higher-level curricula, particularly in the subjects in which they excel. Most classroom teachers do not have the time or training to provide special curricula for these students or to present material in such a way as to fully motivate the gifted learner to excel.

(from TYLER-WOOD & CEREJO, page 9)

five school-related factors of self-concept. The instrument provides five factor scales in the areas of: Aspiration, Anxiety, Academic Interest and Satisfaction, Leadership and Initiative, and Identification vs. Alienation. For the secondary school population, reports of validity and reliability fall in the acceptable range. The DOSC was developed to measure non-cognitive factors associated with self-esteem or self-concept in school settings (DOSC, 1989).

RESULTS

A comparison of exiting scores was conducted using a series of three ANOVAs. All three groups differed significantly (p<.05) on total SAT scores (See Table 1). On the quantitative section of the SAT, the early college admission students scored significantly (p<.05) higher when compared to the contrast group. On the verbal section of the SAT, early college admission students scored significantly (p<.05) higher when compared to students participating in the differentiated curriculum and students in the contrast group.

Exiting scores on the DOSC were compared among the three groups using a series of five ANOVAs (See Table 2). The analysis of the data indicated that students in the early college admissions group scored significantly (p<.05) higher when compared to the contrast group students on the subscale of Aspiration. The Aspiration subscale reflects behavior patterns that portray the degree to which achievement levels and academic activities are consistent with students’ perceptions of their scholastic potentialities. Students in the contrast group scored significantly (p<.05) higher on the subscale of Identification vs. Alienation when compared to the other two groups, indicating that students who remain in the regular high school setting identify more closely with their peer group. Students in the early college admission group scored significantly (p<.05) higher on Academic Interest when compared to the other groups. The Academic Interest subscale is purported to measure degree of intrinsic motivation gained by students in performing academic work.

The 56 students who remained in high school were surveyed to determine why they had elected to remain in the high school setting as opposed to entering college early. Twelve students indicated that they were not aware that early admission to college was an option. Thirty-two students indicated that they remained in high school because of sports, band, cheerleading, or other extracurricular activities. Six students indicated they remained in high school for financial reasons. Two students indicated they remained in high school for "other" unspecified reasons. Four students did not respond to this question on the survey.
DISCUSSION

Reis and Follo (1993) have explored a total of seven models, which are employed to provide services to the academically talented secondary student. Gallagher (1985) surveyed 1200 secondary teachers, administrators, and parents and determined that advance placement classes within the high school were the most preferred service delivery model for secondary gifted students. The current study indicates that we should question the feasibility of finding one service delivery model to serve all secondary gifted students. An array of service delivery models is necessary to meet the needs of the academically talented students. At the equivalent of the end of their twelfth grade year students showed significant differences on the subtests of the DOSC. However, the current study has some limitations. Because no measure of self-concept was administered at an early age, it is impossible to determine if changes in self-concept occurred because of programming choices or if differences in self-concept were inherent. It is important to note that significant differences exist among the three groups on the variables of SAT scores and DOSC scores. There appears to be a need for an array of programming options to meet the needs of gifted high school students. It is important to make high school students aware of various programming options available. It is also important for students to understand that student characteristics may vary among the programming options. Students who elect early college admission may be more academically oriented and less concerned with the social opportunities high school offers. Students electing to enter college early may find that students in the early college admissions program are more academically oriented when compared to gifted students who elect to remain in high school. Additional research should be conducted to determine at what age differences in self-concept became apparent among the participants in the three service delivery models. If one can determine which student characteristics are best suited for each service delivery model, the information could prove most valuable in assisting gifted students with programming options.

Table 1

Comparison of SAT Scores of Contrast, Differentiated and Early College Admission Students

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total SAT</th>
<th>Quantitative</th>
<th>Verbal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Contrast</td>
<td>1218</td>
<td>615</td>
<td>603</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Differentiated</td>
<td>1295</td>
<td>651</td>
<td>644</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early College Admission</td>
<td>1383</td>
<td>685</td>
<td>698</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2
Comparison of Mean DOSC Percentile Scores of Contrast, Differentiated and Early College Admission Students

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Aspiration</th>
<th>Anxiety</th>
<th>Academic Interest</th>
<th>Leadership</th>
<th>ID vs. Alienation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Contrast</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Differentiated</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early College Admission</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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gifted and talented children. You have a voice...you have an opportunity to make a difference. Please contact the elected officials in your constituency, and express your desire to ensure that gifted youngsters in the state of Texas are afforded the educational opportunities they so desperately need and deserve!

On behalf of the Texas Association for the Gifted and Talented, I would like to express my gratitude to you for choosing to be a member of the world’s largest advocacy group for gifted youngsters. I look forward to serving as the president of TAGT and invite you to enthusiastically participate in striving to address the pressing issues and circumstances that gifted children face daily in classrooms around the state. Together, we can be influential. Together, we can make a significant difference. Together, we can continue to forge a trail that leads to appropriate educational opportunities for gifted children.

HUMANITIES BOARD ANNOUNCES OUTSTANDING TEACHING NOMINATIONS FOR 2001

The Texas Council for the Humanities (TCH), a state partner of the National Endowment for the Humanities (NEH), is now accepting nominations for the 12th anniversary of its Outstanding Teaching of the Humanities Awards, an annual program to recognize and reward exemplary contributions of humanities teachers. Since 1990, the program has drawn nominations for 1,100 Texas teachers representing 786 schools from 330 towns and cities.

Any student, parent, fellow teacher, school administrator, or member of the public may nominate any full-time teacher presently teaching one or more humanities courses in a Texas elementary, middle or high school, either public or private. However, please note that an individual may nominate only one teacher per year. Nomination forms must be postmarked no later than midnight, April 1, 2001.

This year the TCH is also seeking nominations for the new Linden Heck Howell Outstanding Teaching of Texas History Award, which honors a former chairman of the Council’s Board of Directors. Selection criteria and nomination deadlines for this award are identical to the Outstanding Teaching of the Humanities Awards, except nominees must be full-time teachers of Texas History.

Award decisions by the TCH Board of Directors are based on merit for outstanding contributions to the teaching of humanities in Texas, with a primary emphasis placed upon classroom activities. Examples include, but are not limited to, distinguished teaching; innovative teaching methods; introduction of new teaching aids, such as computer technologies; successful introduction of new courses, such as international studies, women’s history, or ethnic history; and development of teacher training programs or workshops.

In June 2001, the TCH will announce the first winner of the Linden Heck Howell Award who will receive a plaque and a cash award of $1,000. The Council will also announce the six Texas K-12 teachers to receive Outstanding Teaching of the Humanities Awards. Each winner will receive a plaque and a cash award of $2,000, of which $1,000 will go to the teacher to further professional development, and $1,000 will go to the teacher’s school for the purchase of humanities instructional material and/or for the improvement of humanities courses and programs. Up to eight teachers will be selected to receive Outstanding Teaching of the Humanities Honorable Mention plaques.

For more information concerning the awards, please contact Program Officer Carol Parsonage at 512/440-1991 ext. 126 or cparsonage@public-humanities.org. Forms for both award programs are available online at www.public-humanities.org.
The affective area is defined by a variety of concepts: self-esteem, self-concept, identity, self-confidence, self-perceptions, social behaviors, social and emotional development, and issues such as perfectionism and depression. Some of these concepts are also multidimensional. For example, when talking about “self concept,” Dixon (1998) describes “academic self concept” and “social self concept” using different characteristics. This review, therefore, included a wide variety of articles that addressed diverse social, emotional, and counseling topics. Articles published in Gifted Child Quarterly, Journal for the Education of the Gifted, and Roeper Review during the past ten years were examined (1990-2000). To be included, the article needed to have an empirical base. Articles that offered only suggestions, summarized previous studies, or were conducted outside the United States were not included in this review. Using these criteria, 44 articles were discovered.

Of these, approximately one third addressed self-concept areas such as identity, self-perceptions, self-confidence, and self esteem; one third, emotional issues and social behaviors; and one fourth, adjustment and counseling areas. The sample in the vast majority of the articles was adolescents who were in gifted programs. Researchers examined the affective characteristics of young children in only three articles. However, one third of the articles did include special groups in their sample: females (7), males (2), Hispanics (1), Blacks (3), and learning disabilities (1).

Because of the diversity of concepts and, therefore definitions, researchers used 37 different measures in gathering data. In fact, only two studies used the same instruments: the Multidimensional Perfectionism Scale and the Fear of Success Scale. The researchers designed the majority of the instruments, which may have uncertain reliability and validity data. When qualitative data were collected, researchers used primarily interviews. They collected observation data in only four studies. For the most part, conclusions were based on self-report instruments: surveys, questionnaires, and rating scales. Since bright students are able to discern the most desirable responses and may compromise self-report measures, educators need to be cautious in interpreting and using the summary of these studies.

Eight of the studies reported few differences between gifted and general education students in perfectionism, behavior problems, stress, and maladjustment (Cornell et. al, 1994; Gallucci, Middleton, & Kline, 1999; LoCicero & Ashby, 2000). Norman, Ramsay, Martray, and Roberts (1999) also found no differences in behavior problems among high and low levels of giftedness. On the other hand, other researchers reported that gifted students relied on behaviors reflecting social adjustment at the expense of their own emotional needs (Sowa & May, 1997). The highly gifted were more likely to deny their giftedness in an attempt to “fit in.” Highly verbal gifted students, therefore, have the lowest levels of peer acceptance because they are less able to mask their gifts (Swiatek, 1995). Dixon (1998) also found that while gifted students have high self-concepts regarding academics, they struggle with perfectionism and risk-taking. Orange (1997) reported that when asked about procrastination, 89% of the gifted students responded “almost always.”

For boys to be successful in a male culture, researchers report that they need to fit into the male culture: be strong and bond with other boys (Hébert, 1991). While boys’ discouragement appears to peak in junior high school, it declines in high school as they focus more on their career and less on relationships (Kline & Short, 1991b). On the other hand, as gifted girls develop, their self-concept scores decrease (Kline & Zehms, 1996). They attribute this decline to increases in perfectionism and the increasing importance of relationships (Kline & Short, 1991a). Latina women have a special challenge: non-traditional in academic settings and traditional at home which may lead to physical exhaustion or a repression of achievement (Thorne, 1995).

In defining themselves, gifted students vary in their self-perceptions and use both internal and external comparisons (Ablard, 1997). A high correlation exists between high self-concepts and high achievement (Williams, 1998). Gifted students who are most vulnerable are those who are the most disparate from their peers, those who believe that acceptance is more important than achievement, and use strategies to mask their high ability (Ablard, 1997). Underachievement appears to be related to a variety of factors: negative peer pressure, poor peer relationships, isolation, sensitivity to differences, unchallenging or uninteresting curriculum, poor family relationships, and inadequate self-regulation (Baum, Renzulli, & Hébert, 1995; Emerick, 1992; Ford & Harris, 1997).

When adjusting to the situation, gifted students seek an outlet for expression and a capacity to influence (Jackson, 1998). While coping strategies may vary across races with Blacks and Hispanics seeking spiritual support (Plucker, 1998), most researchers believe that counseling should address these areas in meeting the needs of gifted students: self-reflection, personal empowerment, interactions with peers and adults, stress management, self-regulation and other coping strategies.

In conclusion, educators should consider creating an environment where gifted students have opportunities to “find a sense of who they are, what they might be capable of doing, who they might associate with and be successful, be liked by others whom they see as significant, feel free to express themselves and still be accepted, find peers and adults who get as excited as they do about abstract and ethical topics, and be a minority of one and still survive” (Coleman, 1995, p. 173).

Ablard, K. E. (1997). Self-perceptions and needs as a function of type of academic ability and gender. Roeper Review, 20(2), 110-115. Subjects in this study were drawn from a population of Talent Search participants at the Institute for the Academic Advancement of Youth. Overall 49% of the males, and 42% of the females participated (N=174 students). These students were mailed two questionnaires to measure their overall self-perceptions in academic and social areas and overall self-confidence and adjustment. Overall, academically talented students did not report lower social self-perceptions. However, results indicate that gifted students vary in their self-perceptions and needs. Students at risk for social difficulties include those whose abilities are most disparate from their peers; whose need to achieve is weaker than their desire to be accepted by peers; and who would use strategies that mask their high ability.

Baum, S. M., Renzulli, J. S., & Hebert, T. P. (1995). Reversing underachievement: Creative productivity as a systematic intervention. Gifted Child Quarterly, 39(4), 224-235. Twelve teachers who received training in Renzulli’s Enrichment Triad Model selected 17 students, ages 8-13, identified as gifted who were also underachieving in their school performance. These data were collected: Interest-Ability Inventory, Self-Efficacy for Academic Tasks; Scales for Rating the Behavioral Characteristics of Superior Students; student essays, teacher observation, interviews, and product assessment. The researchers found that a combination of factors contributed to the pattern of underachievement: emotional issues (dysfunctional families, need for attention, perfectionism, and depression), social-behavioral issues (inappropriate peer group, questioning of social values, social skills, and lack of behavioral controls), curricular issues (unchallenging and uninteresting curriculum) and self-regulation (lack of organization, time management skills; possible learning disability). After the intervention, most of the students were no longer underachieving in their school setting because of the (a) relationship with the teacher, (b) presentation of self-regulation strategies, (c) opportunities to work in an area of interest, (d) opportunities for interacting with an appropriate peer group; and (e) opportunities to learn about the issue of underachievement.

Coleman, L. J. (1995). The power of specialized educational environments in the development of giftedness: The need for research on social context. Gifted Child Quarterly, 39(3), 171-176. Coleman argues that professionals should use not only objective indicators but also subjective psychological experiences in judging the success of programs for gifted and talented children. Such indicators might include a change in the students’ sense of who they are, what they might be capable of doing, who they might associate with and be successful; being liked by others whom they see as significant, feeling free to express themselves and still be accepted, finding peers and adults who get as excited as they do about abstract and ethical topics, and being a minority of one and still surviving (p. 173). Coleman provides a framework for conducting further research on the social context in specialized environments. The author concludes, “a social context is created which develops knowledge, skills and attitudes that are unlikely to develop in regular settings” (p. 176).

Cornell, D. G., Callahan, C. M., & Loyd, B. H. (1991). Socioemotional adjustment of adolescent girls enrolled in a residential acceleration program. Gifted Child Quarterly, 35(2), 58-66. This study investigated the socioemotional adjustment of 44 female students enrolled in an early college entrance/acceleration program at a liberal arts college during a single academic year. The students ranged in age from 13 to 17 years. Using multiple measures (Jackson Personality Inventory, Family Environment Scale, staff reports and logs, peer sociogram, student questionnaire), the authors did find evidence of socioemotional adjustment problems. Over half were reported as suffering from a period of depression, half were seen for counseling, and 11 were referred to outside mental health professionals. Thirteen girls left the program for reasons judged as stress-related. Adjustment appeared to relate to responsibility, interpersonal interest, social self-confidence, positive social self-concepts, harmonious family relationships, and open communication with their mothers. The authors suggest that parents, teachers, and counselors of students considering acceleration programs should examine the students’ socioemotional adjustment before recommending early college admission.

Cornell, D. G., Delcourt, M. A. B., Bland, L. C., Goldberg, M. D., Oram, G. (1994). Low incidence of behavior problems among elementary school students in gifted programs. Journal for the Education of the Gifted, 18(1), 4-19. This report summarizes a comparison of 675 gifted and 322 regular education students in grades 2 or 3 on the incidence of behavior problems as rated by parents and teachers. They found that there were no significant differences between the gifted and regular education students. However, they did find...
that the relationship between parent and teacher ratings was low, which may be a result of subjective differences in perceptions or true differences in student behavior across settings.


Emerick, L. J. (1992). Academic underachievement among the gifted: Students' perceptions of factor(s) that reverse the pattern. *Gifted Child Quarterly, 36*(3), 140-146. This study investigated factors that reversed the underachievement pattern in 10 gifted students, ages 14 to 20 who moved from chronic underachievement to academic success. After the identification of the subjects, data were collected from written responses to an open-ended questionnaire and one to three in-depth interviews. Six factors were identified by the students as having a positive impact on their academic performance: out-of-school interests; parents who approved of the out-of-school interest and maintained a positive attitude toward them; classes that were challenging, encouraged discussion, and provided opportunities for independent study in areas of interest; academic goals; actions and respect for a particular teacher; and self-confidence and a desire for academic success.

Ford, D. Y., & Harris III, J. (1997). At study of the racial identity and achievement of Black males and females. *Roeper Review, 20*(2), 105-110. This study examined the racial identity and achievement of 152 Black males and females. Sixty-two students were underachieving with the greatest percentage being male. Students were administered the Racial Identity Scale for Black Students. Underachievers had less positive racial identities than achieving students. The authors conclude that counseling strategies may have to focus on helping some Black students cope with the difficulties inherent in attending gifted programs that are often predominantly white: negative peer pressures, poor peer relations, feelings of isolation, and sensitivity about feeling different.

Frey, C. P. (1998). Struggling with Identity: Working with seventh-and eighth-grade gifted girls to air issues of concern. *Journal for the Education of the Gifted, 21*(4), 437-451. This action research paper describes the materials and outcomes of a “women’s issues” group with 7th and 8th grade gifted girls. The goals of the group were to maintain individual voices instead of conforming; to learn appropriate interactions with one another; to address the issues of perfectionism and self-esteem; to plan future career options; and to learn self-advocacy skills. The girls said that they were not embarrassed to be smart, they liked learning, liked thinking about abstract issues, and high academic goals.

Gallucci, N. T., Middleton, G., & Kline, A. (1999). Intellectually superior children and behavioral problems and competence. *Roeper Review, 22*(1), 5-9. This study compared the differences in ratings of behavior problems and competence from the Child Behavior Checklist between samples of 78 adolescent children with intelligence quotients greater than 130 and 62 adolescent children with intelligence quotients in the average range. The researchers found no differences between the groups. The prevalence of behavioral problems was infrequent in both samples.

Garland, A. F., & Zigler, E. (1999). Emotional and behavioral problems among highly intellectually gifted youth. *Roeper Review, 22*(1), 41-44. This study explored the relationship between moderate and extreme levels of intellectual giftedness and psychosocial problems. The 191 students who participated in a summer program for intellectually talented youth in California were administered the Child Behavior Checklist and SAT. The authors found no differences between groups.

Grantham, T., & Ford, D. (1998). A case study of the social needs of Danisha: An underachieving gifted African-American female. *Roeper Review, 21*(2), 96-101. This case study of a 15-year-old underachieving gifted African-American female was conducted to identify social and emotional needs of gifted students. Data were collected through interviews, field observations, and school data. The authors found that Danisha struggled to accept Caucasian students' social norms and felt isolated in her gifted and talented classes. She wanted to integrate into the gifted classes, yet she didn't want to forfeit her relationships with her African-American friends. They suggested that counseling needed to focus on issues related to racial identity; teachers needed multicultural training; and coordinators needed to identify more minority students in classes.

Hébert, T. P. (1998). Gifted Black males in an urban high school: Factors that influence achievement and underachievement. *Journal for the Education of the Gifted, 22*(4), 385-414. The case studies reported in this article describe the experiences of two gifted African American males in an urban high school. Factors that influenced achievement appeared to be belief in self, family support, multicultural appreciation, sensitivity, and high aspirations. Factors that influenced underachievement appeared to be an inappropriate match with the curricular activities and learning style, inappropriate counseling and class placement, inconsistent family role models. The authors suggest the importance of...
training counselors for diversity, working closely with families, and providing enrichment activities outside the school days.

Hébert, T. P. (1991). Meeting the affective needs of bright boys through bibliotherapy. Roeper Review, 13(4), 207-212. The author uses case studies of gifted students to present six issues that face gifted boys: image management, self-inflicted pressure, being labeled “different,” the need for male bonding, cultural expectations, and gender role conflict. He discusses the need for gifted boys to mask their identities to survive in a male culture; to be the best and always be strong; to “fit in,” to bond with other boys his age, and to nurture traits considered non-masculine. The author provides a resource list of books that might be used with gifted boys in building positive self-concepts.

Hay, C. A., & Bakken, L. (1991). Gifted sixth-grade girls: Similarities and differences in attitudes among gifted girls, non-gifted peers, and their mothers. Roeper Review, 13(3), 158-160. The sample of 36 gifted sixth-grade girls and their mothers and 34 non-gifted sixth grade girls and their mothers were administered four inventories: Attitudes Toward Women Scale, the Personal Attributes Questionnaire, the Fear of Success Scale, and the Occupational Check List. There were no significant differences in attitudes toward women in society between gifted daughters and their mothers. More differences existed between non-gifted girls and their mothers. Overall, the data indicated that non-gifted daughters are more likely to see traditional behavior at home than their gifted peers. Non-gifted daughters also were much more fearful of offending someone else, fearful of losing relationships, and fearful of getting ahead of another than their mothers. Gifted daughters indicated similar levels of fear of success as did their mothers. In addition, gifted girls chose more contemporary jobs and non-gifted girls more traditional.

Jackson, P. S. (1998). Bright star—black sky: A phenomenological study of depression as a window into the psyche of the gifted adolescent. Roeper Review, 20(3), 215-221. This qualitative study presented the results of the depressive experience of 10 gifted adolescents. The students demonstrated at least three or more of the symptoms listed in the Diagnostic Criteria for Depression (DSM IV). The duration of the depression was from two weeks to two years. These adolescents reported that they did not have an outlet for expressing their gifts and/or talents, lacked the capacity to influence or express themselves openly, and extreme experiences of the presence or absence of feeling. The need for knowledge, communion, and expression provide the basis for understanding the depressive phenomenon. The author suggests that these adolescents needed counseling approaches that foster self-reflection, empathy, and personal empowerment.

Klein, A. G., & Zehms, D. (1996). Self-concept and gifted girls: A cross sectional study of intellectually gifted females in grades 3, 5, and 8. Roeper Review, 19(1), 30-34. The purpose of this study was to explore whether self-concept in intellectually gifted girls in grades 3, 5, and 8 declined by grade level. The authors administered the Piers-Harris Children’s Self-Concept Scale to 134 girls in Eau Claire, WI. They found that grade 8 gifted girls had a lessened sense of self when compared with younger gifted girls, particularly those in grade 3. The 8th grade girls scored significantly lower on behavior, intellectual and school status, and happiness and satisfaction. They recommend that schools celebrate girls’ strong self-esteem, respect girls as key players, connect girls to caring adults, ensure their participation in their success, and empower them to realize their dreams.

Kline, B. E., & Short, E. B. (1991a). Changes in emotional resilience: Gifted adolescent females. Roeper Review, 13(3), 118-121. The researchers investigated the social and emotional changes in 89 gifted females in 9th through 12th grades. Each subject completed a 138-item questionnaire. The items related to school adjustment, interests and activities, family and adult connections, social and leadership issues, planning and goals, thinking styles, and feelings. The results indicated a significant decrease in self-confidence and in increase in perfectionism and discouragement. Relationships with parents and other adults decline while peer relationships become more prominent. The authors suggest that these gifted girls need career planning, strong models, and identity information.

Kline, B. E., & Short, E. B. (1991b). Changes in emotional resilience: Gifted adolescent boys. Roeper Review, 13(4), 184-187. The researchers investigated the social and emotional changes in 82 gifted males in 9th through 12th grades. Each subject completed a 138-item questionnaire. The items related to school adjustment, interests and activities, family and adult connections, social and leadership issues, planning and goals, thinking styles, and feelings. The results indicated that discouragement and hopelessness peak at junior high school and then decline in senior high school. Most gifted boys decide to emphasize career success and relegate emotional and relational themes to a lower order of priority. The authors conclude that gifted boys may be influenced by societal expectation, i.e., males do not show emotions.

LoCicero, K. A., & Ashby, J. S. (2000). Multidimensional perfectionism in middle school age gifted students: A comparison to peers from the general cohort. Roeper Review, 22(3), 182-185. This study examined how gifted students differ from a group of their peers on a multidimensional measure of perfectionism. The sample of 195 adolescents who were predominantly Caucasian and attended a southeastern middle school system. They were administered the Almost
Perfect Scale: Revised. The authors found that gifted students may be more perfectionistic in adaptive ways (holding high personal standards) but not in maladaptive ways (increased distress resulting between one's standards and one's performance).

Luftig, R. L., & Nichols, M. L. (1991). An assessment of the social status and perceived personality and school traits of gifted students by non-gifted peers. Roeper Review, 13(3), 148-153. This study sought to investigate the social status levels ascribed to gifted students by their non-gifted age peers. A total of 496 students (64 were gifted) completed a peer nomination form designed to measure peer status, peer popularity, and possession of personality and school attributes. Gifted boys were the most popular of the gifted groups; gifted girls, the least popular. Gifted boys were viewed as having a good sense of humor while gifted girls were viewed as moody and melancholy. Gifted boys were perceived to be more physically attractive than non-gifted boys and were found to be less aggressive, more creative, and smarter than children in the other groups.

Lupkowski, A. E., Whitmore, M., & Ramsay, A. (1992). The impact of early entrance to college on self-esteem: A preliminary study. Gifted Child Quarterly, 36(2), 87-90. This study examined the effects of early entrance in the North Texas Academy of Mathematics and Science on 191 students' self-esteem. The students responded to the Coopersmith Self-Esteem Inventory prior to their first semester and at the beginning of their second semester. The self-esteem of the group of students did not change in a meaningful way during the first semester of the program.

Manaster, G. J., Chan, J. C., Watt, C., & Wiche, J. (1994). Gifted adolescents' attitudes toward their giftedness: A partial replication. Gifted Child Quarterly, 36(4), 176-178. Using a sample of 144 gifted and talented students who attended a summer Governor's School and who responded to open-ended questions about the term 'gifted,' the researchers discovered that labeling effects are multifaceted. First, these gifted students see themselves as more unlike other students on academic traits, personal performance, and academic performance and more like others on social performance. Second, the majority of the students thought that the worst aspects of being gifted were social because of stereotyping. Third, being gifted was a positive experience for the majority of the students. Fourth, most students didn't acknowledge any special treatment from friends or parents because of their special abilities; however, the majority thought that teachers treated them differently. The authors concluded that there is no major struggle in coming to terms with their own giftedness for many adolescents.

Manor-Bullock, R., Look, C., & Dixon, D. N. (1995). Is giftedness socially stigmatizing? The impact of high achievement on social interactions. Journal for the Education of the Gifted, 18(3), 319-338. The sample in this study consisted of 51 juniors from the Indiana Academy. Each responded to a survey with seven open-ended questions and a Social Interaction Questionnaire. Four themes emerged from the analysis of the data. The students felt socially different from their peers in the high school: more introverted than extroverted and more academic. However, they did report that they didn't feel lonely and that they had a group of friends. Most felt that they were at the top of their classes and were not concerned about hiding their abilities. None of the students felt excluded at the Academy; however 30% had felt excluded at their previous school. For the most part, the students felt different in a good way" (p. 334).

Metha, A., & McWhirter, E. H. (1997). Suicide ideation, depression, and stressful life events among gifted adolescents. Journal for the Education of the Gifted, 20(3), 284-304. The purpose of this study was to identify whether gifted and nongifted adolescents differ in terms of the number and perceived stressfulness of life-change events, depression, and suicide ideation. Thirty-four gifted and 38 nongifted participated in this study. They were administered the Adolescent Life-Change Event Scale and the Beck Depression Inventory. They found that depression and stress are significantly and positively associated with suicide ideation. Although the gifted adolescents had experienced a significantly higher number of life-changing events, there was no statistically significant difference in reported stress. No other differences were noted.

Miller, N. B., Silverman, L. K., & Falk, R. F. (1994). Emotional development, intellectual ability, and gender. Journal for the Education of the Gifted, 18(1), 20-38. Dabrowski's Theory of Emotional Development was used as a framework in studying the personality development of 41 intellectually gifted adults and 42 graduate students. Data were collected using the Overexcitabilities Questionnaire and the Definition Response Instrument. The gifted adults' overexcitabilities (OE) were higher than those of graduate students. Women tended to score higher on emotional OE and men on intellectual OE. No differences were found in emotional development.

Moon, S. M., Kelly, K. R., & Feldhusen, J. F. (1997). Specialized counseling services for gifted youth and their families: A needs assessment. Gifted Child Quarterly, 41(1), 16-25. The purpose of this study was to examine the types of counseling services that parents, teachers, counselors, and related professionals perceived as important for gifted youth and their families. A survey was mailed to parents (n=64), school personnel (n=238), counseling professionals (n=15) and professors (n=18). Needs were found in these areas: testing...
and assessment services; guidance and educational planning; training programs for teachers, principal, counselors, psychologists, and parents; and counseling in peer relationships, emotional adjustment, social adjustment and stress management. The researchers conclude that specialized counseling needs of the gifted are high but that services are not readily available.

Nail, J. M., & Evans, J. G. (1997). The emotional adjustment of gifted adolescents: A view of global functioning. *Roeper Review, 20*(1), 18-21. The purpose of the study was to determine if 115 academically gifted adolescents differ from 97 nongifted adolescents with regard to their perception of overall emotional adjustment as measured by the Self-Report of Personality and the Behavior Assessment System for Children. Results indicated that the gifted students were emotionally better adjusted on this self-report instrument.

Norman, A. D., Ramsay, S. G., Martray, C. R., & Roberts, J. L. (1999). Relationship between levels of giftedness and psychosocial adjustment. *Roeper Review, 22*(1), 5-9. The purpose of this study was to examine the level of psychosocial adjustment between highly gifted students (N=74) and moderately gifted (N=163). The students who attended summer programs for gifted students were administered the Otis Lennon, the Self-Description Questionnaire-II, the Emotional Autonomy Scale, and the Children’s Manifest Anxiety Scale. They found no significant differences between groups.

Orange, C. (1997). Gifted students and perfectionism. *Roeper Review, 20*(1), 39-41. During an honors conference, 109 of the 356 participants chose to respond to a Perfectionism Quiz. The gifted students tended to score high on the Quiz, with 89% of the participants responding “always” or “almost always” to “I sometimes needlessly delay doing something I have to do.” The author believes that knowledge of items with high scores may be useful for identifying problem areas of gifted students. These areas included need for order, need for approval of others, obsessive-compulsive demands on self, anxiety and excessive worry, indecision, and procrastination.

Parker, W. D. (1996). Psychological adjustment in mathematically gifted students. *Gifted Child Quarterly, 40*(3), 154-157. The Brief Symptom Inventory was administered to 274 mathematically gifted students, the majority in the 7th and 8th grades, who participated in the Center for Talented Youth of the Johns Hopkins University. The author found that the mean scores and standard deviations were lower for all measures of maladjustment than the normative adolescent group.

Parker, W. D., & Mills, C. J. (1996). The incidence of perfectionism in gifted students. *Gifted Child Quarterly, 40*(4), 194-199. A sample of 600 academically talented sixth grade students who had participated in a national talent search were used for this study. A comparison group consisted of 418 sixth graders from a nationally gathered sample of students who were not identified as gifted or talented. Data were collected from the Multidimensional Perfectionism Scale, the Standard International Occupational Prestige Scale. The authors found that no higher incidence of perfectionism among gifted students than in the comparison group. Both groups came from a similar socioeconomic status.

Plucker, J. A. (1998). Gender, race, and grade differences in gifted adolescents’ coping strategies. *Journal for the Education of the Gifted, 21*(4), 423-436. To determine differences in coping strategies among different demographic groups, Plucker examined 749 gifted and talented adolescents who attended residential summer enrichment programs. Coping strategies were assessed by using the Adolescent Coping Scale, a self-report instrument. Differences were found across race. African American and Hispanic students had the highest scores on Seeking Spiritual Support scale, Caucasians, on Self-Blame scale, and Hispanics on Worry scale.

Roberts, S. M., & Lovett, S. B. (1994). Examining the “F” in gifted: Academically gifted adolescents’ physiological and affective responses to scholastic failure. *Journal for the Education of the Gifted, 17*(3), 241-259. Twenty academically gifted, 20 academic achievers, and 20 nongifted students who were all in junior high school participated in this study. Each student completed the self-oriented and socially prescribed perfectionism subscales of the Multidimensional Perfectionism Scale, the Common Belief Inventory for Students, and the School Failure Tolerance Scale in the first session. In the second session, the students’ physiological and affective reactions to an experimentally induced failure situation were recorded. The researchers found that academically gifted adolescents demonstrated a larger stress reaction to the failure experiment than the other two groups. The authors speculated that it may be the gifted label rather than superior intelligence or high levels of achievement that predisposed the gifted children to more negative reactions than their peers. The authors suggest that rational-emotive education might be used with gifted and talented students.

Sayler, M. P., & Brookshire, W. K. (1993). Social, emotional, and behavioral adjustment of accelerated students, students in gifted classes, and regular students in eighth grade. *Gifted Child Quarterly, 37*(4), 150-154. This study investigated the differences in the social, emotional, and behavioral adjustment of eighth grade accelerated students (n=365) when compared with students enrolled in eighth grade gifted classes (n=334) and regular eighth grade students (n=323). Sources of student
data included items from a survey, scales derived from items in the survey, and separate achievement tests. The researchers found that students in the accelerated group had the highest level of internal locus of control. The global self-concepts were higher for both the gifted and accelerated groups and the accelerated students reported that they more likely to be seen as good students by their peers. As expected, the accelerated group had higher achievement scores than did either the gifted or regular group. The authors concluded that acceleration does not lead to academic, social, or emotional maladjustment.

Solow, R. E. (1995). Parents’ reasoning about the social and emotional development of their intellectually gifted children. Roeper Review, 18(2), 142-146. Solow selected ten sets of parents from a larger NRC/GT study to examine how parents reason about the social and emotional development of their gifted children. Trained researchers conducted interviews with all family members and made multiple observations of the children at home, in school and in community activities to determine the factors that contributed to or detracted from successful adjustment. Regardless of whether the parent used the gifted label, all of the families acknowledged that their children were exceptional in some area. Some of the parents felt that their children were socially well adjusted (able to make friends both in and outside the classroom); others perceived problems that related to their giftedness. They also identified prominent traits: adulthood, perfectionism, procrastination, and a low tolerance of frustration. The author concluded that some of the parents have no particular framework when talking about their children while others use an intellectual framework only; intellectual and partial social-emotional framework; and comprehensive framework that includes both intellectual and social/emotional. The author suggests that parents be provided more information about the social and emotional differences of their gifted children.

Sowa, C. J., & May, K. M. (1997). Expanding Lazarus and Folkman’s paradigm to the social and emotional adjustment of gifted children and adolescents. Gifted Child Quarterly, 41(2), 36-43. Twenty 9-14 year olds, three males and seventeen females, were recruited through advertisements in professional newsletters and through coordinators of gifted programs. Approximately half of the sample had experienced an adjustment problem as reported by self or by parents. No student had a psychological disorder. Students, their families, teachers, and friends were interviewed about how the gifted child adjusted and coped with stress. Data collection occurred over a year and focused on social and emotional needs. The authors present a model that describes the intrapersonal, family, school, and peer influences, as well as the functional and dysfunctional patterns of social and emotional adjustment. They suggest that gifted children may rely on behaviors reflecting social adjustment at the expense of their own emotional needs or express cognitive appraisals that suggest that they are emotionally adjusted even through their behaviors do not reflect social adjustment.

Swintek, M. A. (1995). An empirical investigation of the social coping strategies used by gifted adolescents. Gifted Child Quarterly, 39(3), 154-161. This study examined the ways that gifted adolescents cope with perceived social difficulties. Several coping strategies were considered in this study including minimizing the visibility of giftedness, denying giftedness, denying concern about possible social rejection, displaying their talents in extracurricular involvement, and the setting of extremely high standards. The subjects were 114 adolescent students who attended the Precollegiate Programs for the Talented and Gifted at Iowa State University. Each student responded to the Adjective Check list and the Social Coping Questionnaire for Gifted Students. These responses and admission data were analyzed. The researcher found that the most highly able individuals were the most likely to deny being gifted. Also, students with predominant verbal abilities reported lower levels of peer acceptance than reports from those with predominant mathematical abilities. The author concludes that verbally gifted students may feel more different from other students and their differentness may be more obvious to others.

Thorne, Y. M. (1995). Achievement motivation in high achieving Latina women. Roeper Review, 18(1), 44-49. This study investigated 63 Latina women who were enrolled or who had completed doctoral programs. They were administered the Work and Family Orientation Questionnaire, the Sex-Role Traditionalism Scale, Fear-of-Success Scale, and a demographic questionnaire. While these women were less sex-role traditional in their attitudes across achievement settings, they demonstrated greater sex-role traditional behaviors in their homes. Negative effects arising from conflict included repression of achievement and physical exhaustion/illness. The author suggests vocational and counseling professional for Latina women who may be struggling with Latino cultural norms and values and its relationship to achievement goals and motivations.

Tucker, B., & Hafenstein, N. L. (1997). Psychological intensities in young gifted children. Gifted Child Quarterly, 41(3), 66-75. This study examined Piechowski’s five overexcitabilities identified by Dabrowski among young gifted children. Data were collected on five young children, ages four through six at the Ricks Center, Denver, CO. Data consisted of classroom observations, documents, achievement tests, Intelligence tests, parent questionnaires, Individual Educational Plan, and teacher interviews. They found that the students demonstrated behaviors consistent with Dabrowski’s theory. All exhibited intellectual overexcitability (curiosity, asking probing questions, intense concentration, excellent problem solving).
solving skills, theoretical knowledge); imaginational overexcitability (fantasy play, animistic and imaginative thinking, daydreaming, dramatic perception); emotional overexcitability (concern for others, timidity and shyness, fear and anxiety, difficulty adjusting to new environments, intensity of feeling); psychomotor overexcitability (marked enthusiasm, rapid speech, surplus of energy, impulsive actions); and sensual overexcitability (sensory pleasures, appreciation of sensory aspects of experiences). The authors conclude that if teachers were aware of these overexcitabilities, they might have better understanding of the emotional development of advanced children.

Vespi, L., & Yewchuk, C. (1992). A phenomenological study of the social/emotional characteristics of gifted learning disabled children. Journal for the Education of the Gifted, 16(1), 55-72. A series of interviews was conducted with four gifted learning disabled boys ages nine to twelve, their parents and their teachers. These themes emerged from an analysis of the data. Most of the children demonstrated positive social skills in the classroom; however, they did appear to have difficulty in establishing and maintaining friendships. Differences were noted among individual characteristics with variations noted in attitudes toward families and in behavior. Overall, the students expressed generally positive feelings of self-image and self-confidence; however, they are frustrated with their underachievement and are afraid of failure. The authors offer these suggestions to educators: effectively identify students who are both LD and gifted; incorporate social/emotional needs into the IEP; foster positive interactions with peers; teach cognitive and behavioral coping skills; educate parents, and treat the whole child.

Williams, J. E. (1998). Self-Concept performance congruence: An exploration of patterns among high-achieving adolescents. Journal for the Education of the Gifted, 21(4), 415-422. This study assessed self-concept to performance congruence in math and English for 103 ninth graders. Students were enrolled in one of five sections of science honors classes in a suburban public high school. The students responded to a questionnaire, ME: Self-Concept Scale for Gifted Children. Williams found that higher levels of self-concept perceptions were associated with greater performance scores on the Iowa Tests of Basic Skills.

Williams, J. E., & Montgomery, D. (1995). Using frame of reference theory to understand the self-concept of academically able students. Journal for the Education of the Gifted, 18(4), 400-409. Using the theory that student academic self-concepts are determined in relation to both internal and external comparisons, the researchers found that gifted and talented students use both frames of referents in determining their self-concepts. Using a self-report instrument, Williams and Montgomery gathered information from 103 ninth graders during their honors physical science class. They discovered that there was a high correlation between verbal and mathematics achievement and low correlations between verbal and mathematics self-concept. They concluded that verbal self-concept may be more influenced by external referents and mathematics by internal referents.

Wright, L. (1990). The social and nonsocial behaviors of precocious preschoolers during free play. Roeper Review, 12(4), 268-274. The purpose of this study was to observe the free play of 26 young children who attended a preschool for developmentally precocious children and examine their social behaviors. The authors used a version of the Play Observation Scale. They found that the gifted children were highly social, using strategies for frequent contact with their peers. The children also changed activities to produce a more social environment. They engaged in associative play, not cooperative play. In addition, the girls engaged in more cooperative and less solitary play than the boys did. The higher IQ group undertook less constructive and more dramatic play than the lower IQ group.

Susan Johnsen is Associate Dean of Scholarship and Professional Development at Baylor University. Editor of Gifted Child Today, she was the principal investigator of Project Mustard Seed. She is author of four tests that are used in identifying gifted students: Test of Nonverbal Intelligence (TONI-2), Screening Assessment for Gifted Students (SAGES), Screening Assessment for Gifted Students—Primary Version (SAGES-P), and Test of Mathematical Abilities for Gifted Students. She is a past President of the Texas Association for the Gifted and Talented.
Question: My child’s class is holding discussions on what it means to be gifted. They are just doing fine in school — why waste valuable discussion time? Is this an appropriate thing to do in a gifted program?
Answer: There are three major issues in your inquiry: the issue of affective needs of gifted learners, the issue of programming for gifted learners, and the issue of time. Part of being a gifted learner is understanding the differences and how to make the most effective use of those differences in order to reach full potential. Being able to relate to other learners who are experiencing similar differences and goals assists gifted students in planning, learning, evaluating, and maintaining a healthy self-esteem. Effective and comprehensive programming for gifted learners incorporate elements that address their social/emotional development. Time that is spent on these activities will vary greatly depending on the program and the needs of the students.

Question: My child was identified for gifted programming in our district. She is pulled out of her third grade classroom twice a week now and misses work that she has to make up. The other kids make fun of her walking down the hall with the gifted teacher and the “brain train.” She comes home in tears every time they meet. Why do we identify for this so called gifted programming? Why do we tell the kids that they are gifted? Frankly, I’m uncomfortable about this labeling.
Answer: Response to gifted services depends on many factors in and out of school: within the school setting consider the appropriateness of the placement, the cognitive, as well as, the social/emotional development of the student, the environment, the program itself, the instructor of the gifted learners, and the on-level classroom instructor. One of the major reasons we identify and serve gifted learners is because they learn/process information differently. This is not just a minor difference. For example, a gifted learner will only need to hear and/or interact with a piece of information one or two times before they reach mastery while a very bright capable student might still need to have the information/repetition repeated as many as six to eight times before they reach mastery. For an on-level learner, the number of repetitions required for mastery increases dramatically. Pacing is significant both to the classroom teacher and the student both now and as they develop into more mature learners.

Gifted learners need to be made aware of their differences so that they may make the most of their learning and build/maintain a healthy self-esteem. Current philosophy in gifted education is that identified gifted students should be having “instead of” experiences and not “in addition to” experiences in the gifted classroom and in the on-level classroom. Check with your daughter’s classroom teacher about what assignments she is missing and if some of them could be eliminated. Check with your daughter’s gifted instructor and classroom teacher about their observations concerning the reaction of other students. Read books on being a parent of a gifted learner. One that I would recommend is They Say My Kid’s Gifted: Now What? By F. Richard Olenchak. Your daughter might enjoy the Gifted Kids’ Survival Guide for Ages 10 and Under by Judy Galbraith. Together as a team, you can make a difference in your daughter’s gifted education experience.

Question: His school has labeled my son GT and LD. I do not want my son to receive the LD services. Can I choose just the GT services?
Answer: Both the giftedness and the learning disabilities need to be addressed. Particular learning disabilities might prevent or unnecessarily delay the full development of some gifts. Gifted students with
learning disabilities may begin to doubt their abilities overall. This could cause them deny or camouflage their gifts which could lead to frustration and perhaps to behavior concerns.

**Question:** I was at a parent meeting and a speaker suggested that families of gifted learners should touch base with a family counselor on a regular basis. What do you think of this?

**Answer:** Counseling is certainly an individual decision and depends on your situation. For anyone who is considering counseling in this situation, find one that is knowledgeable in giftedness. More often than not, where there is a gifted child there is at least one gifted parent heightening sensitivity and intensity. A family counselor specifically trained in aspects of giftedness would be a valuable resource in suggesting strategies concerning these special family dynamics.

Check out SENG (Supporting Emotional Needs of Gifted) at http://www.charweb.org/organizations/page/seng.html for information concerning many aspects of counseling for the gifted. You can join for only $35.00 a year for the entire family. Affiliation in TAGT and other GT interest groups such as SENG will afford you a network in which to share concerns and find other resources such as counselors who have knowledge of giftedness. Reading James T. Webb’s *Guiding the Gifted Child* would be a great place to start.

Donna J. Corley, Ph.D., coordinates gifted programs for Conroe Independent School District. She is also a former member of the TAGT Executive Board. Submit questions relating to gifted education directly to Donna Corley, 702 N. Thompson, Conroe, TX 77301, or by e-mail: dcorley@conroeisd.tenet.edu

---

**Texas Association for the Gifted and Talented**

**Mission Statement**

To promote awareness of the unique social, emotional, and intellectual needs of gifted and talented students and to impact the development of appropriate services to meet these needs.

---

**TAGT Executive Board Long Range Goals**

- Advocate appropriate services and accountability standards for all gifted and talented students.
- Provide current information and research about gifted and talented learners and the field of gifted education to the TAGT membership and general public.
- Develop an effective advocacy network.
- Increase and diversify membership.
- Develop strategic alliances with the Texas Education Agency, Education Service Centers, higher education, and others.
- Support quality professional development for educators of gifted and talented students.

Adopted by the TAGT Executive Board: 2.5.00
A n effective local TAGT Parent Affiliate Group is a natural complement to the efforts of TAGT on behalf of gifted children. "All politics is local" expresses the importance of grassroots support. A positive and organized parent group can influence policy at the local level and above. Now there is an online "Toolkit for Starting and Maintaining an Effective Local Advocacy Group" at http://members.home.com/hebagt/. This site collects papers and links recommended by some seasoned parents as likely to be of great help in starting an effective advocacy group. Please send any comments to r.f.peters@ieee.org.

TAGT is interested in publishing articles in Tempo written from the parent perspective. Please submit articles to Tempo editor Michael Cannon at cannon@whc.net.

Remember that the TAGT Summer Scholarship Award applications is March 1.

This year's conference was chock full of excellent sessions for both educators and parents. There were more parent activities this year, and attendance at both the parent reception and the parent luncheon was way up. Many thanks to the TAGT staff, TAGT board, TAGT Parent and Community Involvement Committee and the Local Arrangements Committee. Now let's share ideas to make the 2001 conference in San Antonio even better! Ideas can be sent to the Parent and Community Involvement Committee via r.f.peters@ieee.org.

Please check out the new TAGT Website at http://www.txgifted.org/ for many new features including a listing of Parent Affiliate contacts from all over the state. If the information regarding your parent affiliate group needs to be updated, please contact the TAGT Webmaster. Be sure also to link to the TAGT Legislative Position Paper as we begin the new legislative session.
Summer 2001  
**Early Childhood:**  
Gifted Children in Primary Grades

There are specific issues in identification and programming for the youngest gifted students. Articles are requested that address these issues, as well as related topics. Original research, theoretical responses, descriptions of successful programs, and experiences of gifted individuals are other possibilities.

The deadline for submission of articles is **March 1, 2001**.

---

Fall 2001  
**Annual Conference Issue:**  
Gifted Students in the Global Community

The global community, with its disappearance of boundaries and expanding options, offers new opportunities as well as evolving responsibilities. What are some of the possibilities for gifted students and how can teachers, parents, and the community prepare students for the widening horizons?

The deadline for submission of articles is **June 1, 2001**.

---

**Guidelines for Article Submissions**

*Tempo* welcomes manuscripts from educators, parents, and other advocates of gifted education. *Tempo* is a juried publication and manuscripts are evaluated by members of the editorial board.

Please keep the following in mind when submitting manuscripts:

1. Manuscripts should be between 1000 and 2500 words on an upcoming topic (see topics above).
2. Use APA style for references and documentation.
3. Submit three copies of your typed, double-spaced manuscript. Use a 1 1/2 inch margin on all sides.
4. Attach a 100—150 word abstract of the article.
5. Include a cover sheet with your name, address, telephone and FAX number and/or e-mail address.

Send all submissions or requests for more information to:
Michael Cannon, TAGT Editorial Office, 5521 Martin Lane, El Paso, TX 79903

---

**Texas Association for the Gifted and Talented Membership Application**

Member Name(s) ___________________________ Telephone: (H) ______________ (W) ______________

Mailing Address ___________________________ City ___________________________ State ______ Zip ______

School District & Campus Name/Business Affiliation ___________________________ ESC Region ______

Email address: ___________________________

PLEASE CHECK ONE: □ Teacher □ Administrator □ Parent □ School Board Member □ Other ______

Individual .................. $35 ( )  Family .....................$35 ( )  Student ..............$15 ( )  Must include verification (campus, district, grade)

Parent .....................$100 ( )  Institutional .............$100 ( )  Lifetime ..............$400 ( )  Parent Affiliate ....$45 ( )

Institutional members receive all the benefits of regular membership, plus may send four representatives to all TAGT conferences at the member rate, regardless of individual membership status.

In addition to your regular membership, you are invited to join a TAGT Division for an additional fee.

Choose either or both:  
G/T Coordinators .....................$10 ( )  Research & Development .....................$10 ( )

Membership Services:  
* Tempo quarterly journal  
* TAGT Newsletter  
* Insights — Annual Directory of Scholarships & Awards  
* TAGT Capitol Newsletter — monthly update during Legislative Session  
* Professional development workshops with in-service credit  
* General Management/Leadership Training  
* School Board Member Training  
* Parent services and information  
* Legislative Representation & Networking  
* Reduced registration fees for conferences and regional workshops

Return form and dues to: TAGT, P.O. Box 200338, Houston, TX 77216-0338.
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