Record: 1

Title:	Psychological intensities in gifted adults.
Authors:	Lewis, Rena B. Kitano, Margie K.
Source:	Roeper Review; Sep92, Vol. 15 Issue 1, p25, 7p, 4 Charts
Document Type:	Article
Subject Terms:	*GIFTED persons *PSYCHOLOGY
Abstract:	Presents a study which investigates affective characteristics of academically gifted adults using Clark's notion of concomitant problems and Dabrowski's construct of overexcitabilities. Doctoral students as subjects; Combination of quantitative and qualitative approaches to data collection; Characteristics of intellectual and emotional overexcitability; Expressions of negative aspects of giftedness.
Full Text Word Count:	6156
ISSN:	02783193
Accession Number:	9604301642
Database:	Academic Search Complete

PSYCHOLOGICAL INTENSITIES IN GIFTED ADULTS

This study investigated affective characteristics of academically gifted adults using two models: Clark's (1983) notion of concomitant problems and Dabrowski's (Piechowski, 1979) construct of overexcitabilities, concepts collectively referred to as "intensities." The population studied was adults who had demonstrated high academic achievement by successfully competing for admission to a doctoral program in Education. Thirty-one doctoral students responded to a researcher developed questionnaire designed to measure intensity characteristics. A subset of 11 students participated in focus groups conducted to investigate qualitatively their perceptions of the concept of psychological intensities. focus group data supported the constructs of intellectual and emotional overexcitabilities and concomitant problems. Factor analysis of questionnaire responses produced five factors. Subjects perceived themselves as different from typical persons on factors reflecting internal motivation, positive aspects of overexcitability, and need for recognition by others. Results, supported empirical literature on gifted individuals' positive self-perceptions as well as the applicability of the concept of psychological intensities to their lives.

Empirical investigations largely characterize gifted children as superior in social and emotional adjustment and self-concept compared to the general population. Simultaneously,

descriptive literature on characteristics of gifted children suggests that such children possess unique psychological traits--perfectionism, heightened sensitivity, strong sense of justice--that may affect their behavior in negative ways. Gallagher (1990) recently observed that little research exists to support the "current wisdom" regarding the emotional status of gifted children. He called for more definitive research evidence on several questions, including the impact of increased sensitivity and stress.

Much of the research on psychological characteristics of the gifted focuses on children and youth. However, the literature on gifted adults reflects the same dichotomy as for children: empirical data support the view of gifted adults as comparatively well adjusted, while a number of professionals in the field have observed gifted adults as possessing unique characteristics that increase susceptibility to stress. In the area of research, Terman's Genetic Studies of Genius (1926) provided evidence of gifted children's superior character development and emotional stability. Their mental health continued into adulthood, as indicated by a normal or below-normal incidence of delinquency, personality disorders, insanity, and alcoholism and equal or superior marital adjustment compared to the general population (Terman & Oden, 1947). Less than 10 percent of subjects in a more recent follow-up study of graduates from a school for gifted students in New York (Subotnik, Karp, & Morgan, 1989) reported having difficulties in mental health.

In contrast, almost 70 years ago, Hollingworth discussed her concerns about the unique adjustment problems of the gifted related to social isolation, nonconformity, interest in theoretical issues, and the special problems of gifted girls (Silverman, 1990). More recently, Willings' (1985) study of a small sample of gifted adults revealed potential for suicide attempts, unhappy marriages, conflict at work, and frequent job changes. Noble (1987,1989) observed that gifted women experience both internal obstacles to achievement, such as lack of self confidence, and external sources of stress, such as supervisors (male and female) feeling threatened by their superior abilities.

Two models describing psychological dimensions of giftedness provide useful frameworks for investigating affective characteristics of gifted individuals. Clark (1983), in her extensive list of characteristics that differentiate the gifted, notes that the same heightened sensitivities that underlie superior intelligence may create a potential for "concomitant problems." For example, a gifted person's strong sense of justice may lead to his or her intense frustration with injustice. Similarly, advanced comprehension and unusual curiosity may be accompanied by the "possible concomitant problems" of poor interpersonal relationships and difficulty conforming.

A second model useful for conceptualizing psychological traits of gifted individuals is Dabrowski's theory of developmental potential as applied to the gifted by Piechowski (1979,1991) and Silverman (1983). Dabrowski's theory suggests that gifted individuals

possess "overexcitabilities" which render them susceptible to psychic disequilibrium. "Overexcitabilities" describe extreme sensitivity and intensity in five areas: psychomotor (capacity for being active and energetic); sensual (awareness of and response to sensory stimuli); intellectual (desire for knowledge); imaginational (vividness of imagery and fantasy); and emotional (depth of feeling). Piechowski (1986) reported that intellectually gifted adults demonstrate higher scores than heterogeneous samples on sensual, intellectual, imaginational, and emotional overexcitabilities using an open-ended measure, the Overexcitability Questionnaire (OEQ). Artists demonstrate stronger overexcitabilities, especially imaginational and emotional, than intellectually gifted adults in all areas except intellectual. Gallagher (1985) and Schiever (1985) found some evidence of relationships between OEQ scores and measures of creativity for children.

The characteristics identified by Clark as "possible concomitant problems" and by Dabrowski as manifestations of "overexcitabilities" collectively are referred to as "intensities" throughout this research report to avoid negative connotations. A preliminary investigation using a Likert-style parent questionnaire (Kitano, 1990) suggested a relationship between intensities and intelligence measures in a heterogeneous group of preschool-age children.

The present study represents the first step in a series of investigations focusing on the relationship between psychological intensities hypothesized to be characteristic of gifted adults and their academic and career pursuits. This first study was designed to determine the extent to which highly achieving adults are characterized by psychological intensities and to develop a model relating the intensities to other characteristics such as concomitant problems. For the purposes of this initial study, high achievement in adulthood was operationally defined as success in the competitive admission process leading to acceptance as a doctoral student in Education. Specific research questions were:

Do gifted adults perceive the concept of psychological intensities as having meaning in terms of their own lives?
What consequences do gifted adults attribute to possession of such intensities?
What types of psychological intensities most ckaracterize gifted adults?
Do gifted adults perceive themselves as differing from typical persons in terms of intensity characteristics?

Method

Research Design

A combination of quantitative and qualitative approaches to data collection was used in this study. Two focus groups were conducted to investigate a small sample of gifted adults' perceptions of the concept of psychological intensities and their consequences. A researcher-developed questionnaire was administered to a larger group to examine the types of intensities that gifted adults attribute to themselves and to their more typical peers. This

combination of methods was deemed most appropriate for the research questions investigated because of the sensitivity of the qualitative approach in the development of theory about the characteristics of gifted adults and the power of quantitative strategies to examine questionnaire data.

Samples

Sample selection was a two-stage process. First, all students enrolled in the doctoral Program in Education offered jointly by San diego State University and claremont Graduate School during the Fall 1990 semester (n = 70) were invited to participate in a focus group activity related to a study on "cognitive and affective characteristics of adults." Eleven students (15.7%), eight females and three males (nine Anglo, one African-American, one Asian-American) volunteered to participate. Next, all students whohad not participated by mail and asked to complete a questionnaire. Twenty students responded, bringing the total number of participants to 31 or 44.3% of the total group.

Data are incomplete for some demographic variables because some students did not respond to that portion of the questionnaire. In the total sample of 31 students, 17 were female. Ethnicity was primarily Caucasian: one student identified himself or herself as Hispanic, two as African-American, and two as Asian. The age of students in the sample ranged from 29 to 56, with an average of 42.0 years (SD = 6.4). As undergraduates, students had earned a mean grade point average (gpa) of 3.0 (SD = .5) on a 1 to 4 scale. Master's degree gpa's ranged from 3.1 to 4.0 (mean = 3.7, SD = .2). Average Graduate Record Examination scores for the group were 570.3 (SD = 113.0) on the Verbal portion of the exam, 524.2 (SD = 110.1) on Quantitative, and 528.4 (SD = 108.6) on Analytic. Many of the students had taken part in special educational experiences during their K-12 years. Most common were early entry, grade skipping, or advanced placement classes (48.3% of the sample), honors programs (35.5%), and gifted education programs (29.0%). In their undergraduate careers, 45.2% had received academic scholarships and 1601% had participated in honors classes.

Instrument

A 102-item Adult Questionnaire was designed by the researchers based on characteristics identified by Clark (1983) and Dabrowski (Piechowski, 1979) as concomitant with giftedness. Subjects were asked to rate each item on two scales, A and B. Scale A used the stem: "This statement describes me," and Scale B: "This statement describes typical persons of my age, gender, and culture." Subjects rated the items on both scales from Almost Perfectly (5) to Hardly at All (1). Examples of items and their source appear in Table 1.

Procedures

Two 2-hour focus groups were conducted following procedures described by Krueger (! 988). The first group consisted of five students, the second of six. The 3-member research team followed a pre-established protocol for conducting the focus groups. One team member

welcomed the group, briefly explained the purpose of the study and focus group methodology, and distributed the consent forms and Adult Questionnaire.

After the forms were completed and collected, a second member of the research team, the designated facilitator, began the interview by setting ground rules for the discussion and describing the theoretical constructs upon which the Adult Questionnaire was based. The first set of questions related to the validity of the concepts of each of the five overexcitabilities and the concept of "concomitant" problems, the impact of any of these characteristics on participants' lives, perceptions of these characteristics in other people, and the implications for educators, other practitioners, or parents. The second set of questions related to gathering information about the questionnaire as a vehicle for eliciting information about intensities and "concomitant" problems. The facilitator closed the focus group by asking for a summary comment from each member, requesting feedback on the process, and thanking the participants.

Both focus groups were audiotaped and at least one research team member took notes throughout the session. Notes were word processed shortly after the session and distributed to team members for review. The audiotapes were used to fill in gaps or clarify questions in the written notes.

Subjects who did not volunteer to participate in focus groups were mailed a copy of the Adult Questionnaire and asked to complete and return it in a return-addressed, stamped envelope. A prompt was mailed to those who did not respond by the deadline resulting in the return of several more questionnaires.

Results of the Focus Groups
As with any qualitative analysis, the analysis of focus group data must be "systematic and verifiable" (Krueger, 1988, p. 111). To ensure that both of these criteria were met, participant responses were taken from the written notes and placed on 3" x 5" index cards. Thus the card stack for each session progressed in chronological order from the first student comment through the last. Index cards were color-coded by session and also included the number of the response from the transcript. Every response--thought stream, sentence, or phrase--that could be interpreted was included. Only those responses that could not be interpreted even in context (e.g., single words) were eliminated. For example, a phrase such as "me too" was included because by checking the response before it, its meaning became clear; but responses such as "oh", "uh," or "hmmm" were not considered interpretable.

Using Dabrowski's theory of "overexcitabilities" and Clark's (1983) notion of "concomitant problems" as the framework for interpreting the data along with two additional areas of concern to the researchers--the impact of these characteristics on participants' lives and origins of the differences--two of the members of the research team independently clustered

the cards from both focus groups into these categories and their subcategories. The development of subcategories was inductive, and responses that represented a single theme within the larger theoretical category were clustered together. The subcategories were assigned names that represented the overall theme being addressed. In some instances, responses contained more than one distinct idea; in those instances, the response was assigned to more than one subcategory.

The results of the two independent analyses and the names that each researcher had attached to each subcategory were then reviewed by all three team members. In instances in which there was disagreement, the rationale was discussed until consensus on the appropriate clustering was reached, and the cards were re-sorted to reflect the agreed-upon category or subcategory, Although there was considerable consistency in the ctegories and subcategories, the names, assigned to the subcategories were more diverse. However, even these differences did not reflect conceptual differences but rather semantic variations in describing the theme. After all subcategories had been agreed upon, the same procedure of review and discussion was used until consensus was reached to finalize the names of each subcategory. a table of categories, sub categories, and verbatim responses was developed to document the decisionmaking process and outcomes and to provide a clustering standard that may be compared to clusters derived from additional focus group data. Table 2 depicts one category with its subcategories and supporting responses.

The final clustering resulted in the theoretical areas of overexcitability proposed in the literature: Intellectual, Emotional, Imaginational, Sensual, and Psychomotor. The literature-based category of "Concomitant Problems" was included along with categories related to the Impact on Life and Origins of Difference. Table 3 provides a listing of the categories with all of their subcategories.

The constructs of overexcitability and resulting "concomitant problems" were supported by participants' comments. Intellectual overexcitability was characterized by a desire to know, persistence, intellectual differences between themselves and others, and pressure from family to achieve.

Emotional overexcitability was reflected in participants' comments about the conflicting needs to express strong emotions versus the need to hold emotions in check. Of particular interest was the extent of discussion that centered on participants' change in the expression of emotions over time. Many viewed themselves as having "put a rid" on their emotions in order to fit into the world around them and as having lost some of their earlier passion about issues. Although possibly attributable to the aging process (the mean age of the sample was 42), participants commented that these changes were not all age related. The existence of emotional extremes was a central part of the discussion with participants describing themselves as experiencing extremes in emotional highs and lows. Participants also focused

on their free expression of emotion with family members and withholding that emotion with outsiders. Humor and several responses that fit no theme were also mentioned.

Imaginational, sensual, and psychomotor overexcitabilities were characterized by considerable discussion of deficits in the psychomotor area and heightened imaginational life. Some participants tended to equate psychomotor with sports achievement and did not perceive themselves as athletically inclined; others simply felt that that they neglected their body to pursue intellectual or creative interests. Many reported highly active imaginations with vivid fantasy lives that they found enriching.

In terms of "concomitant problems," discussion focused on balance, boredom, and misperceptions. Participants felt a strong need to balance the activities of their lives and to try to appreciate the importance of mundane tasks rather than becoming bored quickly. They also reported that others often misperceive them as, for example, radical or nonconformist.

The researchers added two areas to the interview questions--impact on life and origins of the differences. Most discussion on impact of the intensities focused on isolation; participants reported feeling very isolated. Some of this discussion related to an ongoing search for peers and the challenge of finding and maintaining friendships and professional relationships that result in personal and professional growth. Conversely, participants also commented on the enrichment that their differences had contributed to their lives (e.g., participation in a wide range of activities and interests).

The final category developed by the researchers related to participants' perceptions of the origins of the differences between themselves and others, i.e., what had made them highly successful. Primary themes in this category were the identification of specific mentors and the belief that they had made personal choices that made the difference. Self-concept, cultural influences, the roles that they play, and their early upbringing also emerged as subcategories.

Overall, the data gathered in the focus groups supported the notion of intensities and the potential for concomitant problems. Although the interpretation of these data must be considered preliminary, they do provide a framework for further investigation.

Analysis of Questionnaire Data

In an independent analysis, student responses to questionnaire items (Scale A, Self Perceptions) were subjected to a factor analysis using a principal components model with varimax rotation. A factor criterion of 5 was used to investigate the relationship between the questionnaire's factor structure and the five hypothesized sensitivity factors. The five-factor solution accounted for 47.3% of the variance. The first factor accounted for 20.1%, the second 8.9%, the third 7.6%, the fourth 5.8%. and the fifth 4.9%.

Table 4 lists the items and loadings for each factor; only items with loadings greater than or

equal to absolute values of .50 are included. Factor names were derived by examination of the items with highest loadings in each cluster. Factor 1, Cognitive Versatility, is made up of items related to cognition (analytic, critical, and creative thinking); positive affective/emotional characteristics (strong sense of justice; sensitivity to feelings of others); sensual intensity (heightened sensory awareness); and psychomotor intensity (feeling compelled to take action). Factor I is a positive factor, one that embodies many of the desirable characteristics of giftedness. Factor 2, Isolationism, is a less positive factor; it contains items related to isolation and dissatisfaction with the mundane. Factor 2 also contains negative elements of emotional intensity, such as loneliness and self-questioning. Factor 3, Need for Recognition, is composed of items reflecting a need for positive recognition from others. Factor 4, Internal Motivation, includes items related to perseverance, persistence, and adherence to societal norms. Factor 5, Mind Body Dichotomy, consists of items representing a duality: neglect or disregard of the physical self as contrasted with the valuing intellectual activity.

Factor scores were calculated by average students' ratings on individual items that had loadings of .50/.50 or greater. Items with negative loadings were recoded to reflect their contribution to factors. To determine if students perceived themselves differently across the five factors, a one-way repeated measures analysis of variance was performed. Results indicated significant differences across factors ($F = 40.82$, $df = 4$, $p < .001$). Post-hoc testing using Tukey procedures indicated that scores for Factor 4, Internal Motivation, were significantly higher than those for all other factors ($p < .05$). Scores for Factor 1, Cognitive Versatility, were significantly lower than those for Factor 5 but higher than scores for other factors.

Students' ratings of themselves (Scale A) and typical persons (Scale B) were compared using dependent t-tests. Significant differences were found for three comparisons. Students rated themselves significantly higher than typical persons on Factor 1, Cognitive Versatility ($t = 6.97$, $df = 30$, $p < .001$), and Factor 4, Internal Motivation ($t = 6.46$, $df = 30$, $p < .001$). They rated themselves lower than typical persons on Factor 3, Need for Recognition ($t = -2.16$, $df = 30$, $p = .039$).

Implications and Discussion

Qualitative analysis of focus group data was directed at the first two research questions: Do gifted adults perceive the concept of psychological intensities as having meaning in their own lives? What consequences do gifted adults attribute to possession of such intensities? Results provided most support for intensities in the intellectual and emotional realms. Intellectual intensity was characterized by the desire for knowledge and persistence in its pursuit. Associated with these characteristics were boredom, the risk of being misunderstood by others, and a degree of isolationism due to perceived differences from others. In regard to emotional intensity, participants described emotional extremes and the need for emotional

expression. The major concomitant problem was the need to suppress this intensity in order to conform to the expectations of others.

Qualitative analysis provided some support for imaginational and sensual intensities, with participants able to provide examples of ways in which imagination, fantasy, and sensuality enriched their lives. However. participants clearly rejected psychomotor intensity as a group characteristic. One explanation of this divergence from Dabrowski's notion of psychomotor overexcitability is that the subjects misconstrued the concept of psychomotor intensity to mean sports and athletic achievement rather than a need for action.

One interesting finding that emerged from focus group discussions was the difficulty participants reported in answering questions related to typical persons. Students commented that they were uncomfortable attempting to answer questions from the viewpoint of others and that they had difficulty identifying the exact reference group they should use. Comments such as these suggest that interpretation of results of Scale B of the questionnaire should be approached with caution.

Factor analysis of questionnaire data provided by the larger sample was designed to address research questions three and four: What types of psychological intensities most characterize gifted adults? Do gifted adults perceive themselves as differing from typical persons in terms of intensity characteristics? The factors that emerged from the factor analysis reflected more the dual nature of giftedness (concept of concomitant problems) rather than the five intensities. Factor 1. Cognitive Versatility, is an amalgam of many of the positive traits associated with persons with superior intellect. Factor 4, Internal Motivation, likewise a positive factor, deals with persistence, task-commitment, and internal locus of control. Factor 5, Mind-Body Dichotomy, appears overall to be a neutral factor, but one that reflects the duality of positive association with language and negative association with physical activity.

The remaining two factors are expressions of negative aspects of giftedness. The Isolationism factor contains elements of negative aspects of emotional intensity and expresses the frustration gifted adults feel when they perceive themselves as misunderstood by others and the strategies they use to withdraw from others and from tasks they view as uninteresting or lacking challenge. The Need for Recognition factor describes almost the antithesis of isolationism. Here the emphasis is on recognition from others, not understanding, and the need to demonstrate and be recognized for superiority.

Of the five factors identified, gifted adults rated themselves highest on the two most positive factors. Internal Motivation and Cognitive Versatility. Subjects' high self-ratings on Cognitive Versatility are consistent with Piechowski's (1986) report from open-ended measures of intensity that intellectually gifted adults demonstrate higher scores than the general population on several overexcitabilities, including sensual, intellectual. and emotional. The

students in this study viewed the Need for Recognition factor as least descriptive of themselves. In the mid range fell the Mind-Body Dichotomy and the Isolationism factors.

A somewhat different picture emerged when gifted dults were asked to share their perceptions of typical persons. Gifted adults viewed themselves as having more internal motivation than typical person's and as showing more cognitive versatility. Typical persons were seen as showing a greater need for recognition. gifted adults rated themselves and typical persons equally on the factors related to mind-body dichotomy and isolationism.

Consistent with the empirical literature on gifted individuals' self-concept, these results paint a positive picture of the self-perceptions of the gifted adults in this study. These appear to be individuals who view themselves as cognitively able and internally motivated rather than driven by a need for recognitin by others. Despite the reports of focus group participants, gifted students as a group did not describe themselves as isolated. They saw themselves as different from typical persons both in their cognitive competence and in the sources of their motivation, but similar to typical persons in the degree to which they experience isolation.

The discrepancy between focus group and questionnaire data regarding gifted adults' experience of isolation and the more negative aspects of emotional intensity merits discussion. The focus group sample volunteered the concept of "isolation" as one consequence of their intellectual intensity. They also described the need to keep their emotional intensity in check to maintain positive social interactions. One possible explanation for these differences may be that focus group members were more comfortable attributing these behaviors to themselves because (a) the focus group facilitator provided a brief description of the intensity and concomitant problems frameworks prior to the discussion; (b) members, through self disclosure, found they were not alone in having these experiences; and (c) focus group participants often described past experiences with concomitant problems and intensities, prior to doctoral program participation and prior to personal efforts to achieve balance in their lives.

The larger group, receiving no background information before completing the questionnaire and having no opportunity for peer discussion, may have responded in more "socially desirable" ways and/or ways descriptive of current experiences. Focus group members described current doctoral program participation as easing isolation. They also viewed their intellectual intensity as having positive as well as negative consequences, such as personal enrichment. It might be hypothesized that, by the time they reach the middle adult years, successful gifted individuals have learned to control their intensities.

It is clear from the qualitative results of this study that gifted adults, even those who are highly successful in academic pursuits, endorse the dual nature of giftedness and experience the concomitant problems associated with the more positive characteristics. It also is evident that

intellectual, emotional, imaginational, and sensual intensities are reported by gifted adults as valid constructs, ones that describe the ways in which they experience the world. What is perhaps most interesting is the manner in which these two theoretical frameworks became intertwined in the factor analytic study. The factor solution describes the quintessence of the positive sides of giftedness, including aspects of several types of intensity, under the major factor, Cognitive Versatility. Positive personality characteristics associated with achievement are deployed to a second factor, Internal Motivation, while two of the remaining factors describe almost opposite negative effects: isolationism and the need for recognition.

It would be premature to offer recommendations for practice based upon the results of this study. However, the findings suggest that teachers, counselors, and other professionals working with gifted students--even those who appear in every way to be successful--be aware of the ways in which the characteristics of giftedness may make themselves felt in negative ways.

Table 1

Adult Questionnaire: Sample Items and Source

Source	Characteristics	Sample Item
Clark (1983)	idealism and sense of justice	I have an idealistic and strong sense of justice.
Clark	unusual emotional depth and intensity	I feel emotions deeply and intensely.
Clark	self criticism	I am my own worst critic.
Dabrowski (Piechowski, 1979)	psychomotor overexcitability; pressure for action	I become restless with inactivity and have a strong need for action.
Dabrowski	sensual overexcitability;	I see, hear, and experience things

	sensory pleasures	intensely.
Dabrowski	intellectual over excitability; capacity for sustained intellectual effort	I vigorously pursue a ptoblem or task until I complete it, even if it takes a long time.
Dabrowski	imaginational overexcitability; mixing truth and fiction	Sometimes the stories I tell mix truth and fiction.
Dabrowski	emotional over excitbility; identification with others feelings	I react strongly to other people's pain.

Table 2
Example Category with Subcategories and Supporting Responses

INTELLECTUAL INTENSITY
Subcategory: Response Number and Verbatim Response

Desire to know	13	I'm intrested in lots of things; I'd pursue more with more time.
	14	Can sorta' relate - frustration by being in school/career frocus. Lose perspective on world issues. What really excites me is to hear people talk about things I know nothing about!
	18	Find myself driven by curiosity a lot. Like to engage others to learn what it is like to be them - to hve their experiences. Like think about the life of the mind. Can relate quite well. I lose myself in books - can live other lives through books.
	23	I'm being careful about stereotyping. I come

from the exhaustion model. It's just all I can do to keep things going. Used to be more intense. I wanted to be a Carmelite nun so that I could red all day, then I found out that you had to read prayer books. Being in the library all day was wonderful, but it's not possible now.

75 What would we do we didn't -- punishment -- double duty -- work -- school -- intense desire to know on short-and long term basis -- inquisitive -- why refuse to finish --

76 Intensity of whole year -- intensity to know -- what people comment about in me -- it's there -- driven to finish things -- not deadline, grades -- need closure

78 Intensity re: work -- another side is curiosity -- love asking question re:... how world works -- professional pursuits are just wanting to know

Persistence   75 What would we do if we didn't? -- punishment -- double duty -- work -- school -- intense desire to know on short-and long term basis -- inquisitive -- why refuse to finish --

76 Intensity of whole year -- intensity to know -- what people comment about in me -- it's there -- drive to finish things -- not deadline, grades -- need closure

77 Always been successful in this realm -- perpetual machine -- when get this degree, is there another degree to get? Success self rewarding -- I'm moderate in responses -- not excited about it -- just persist.

Perceived   15 Similar to R. I subscribe to bizarre

differences from others		magazines, e.g., Wilson Quarterly.
	16	Others don't get as excited as I do about books, e.g., neighbors.
	17	funny, I get magazines too!
Pressure from family	79	Culture -- first son is to be role model -- pressure from family -- family pressured -- sent to best school -- family decides what you will be -- problem with Oriental families -- my motivation comes from pressure from being first. If I do wrong, they'll all copy.

Table 3

Categories and Subcategories from Focus Grup Data

Category	Subcategory
Intellectual Ovesensitivity	Desire to know
	Persistence
	Perceived differences from others
	Pressure from family
Emotional Oversensitivity	Need to express
	Change over time
	Need to suppress
	Express within families; withhold outside
	Emotional extremes
	Humor
	No Code
Imaginational, Sensual, & Psychomotor Oversensitivities	Deficits
	Psychomotor
	Sensual
	Imaginational
Impact on Life:	Isolation

| Advantages | Enriching |
| and Disadvantages | Search for peers |

Concomitant Problems	Balance
	Boredom
	Misperceived

Origins of Difference	Teachers/Mentor/Peers
	Self-concept
	Roles
	Childrearing
	Culture
	Personal choices

Table 4
Factor Analysis Results, Scale A

Loading   Item

Factor 1: Cognitive Versatility

.79   I have an idealistic and strong sense of justice.
.78   I have heightened sensory awareness and
       take in a high quantity of sensory information
       from the environment

.71   I see, hear, and experience things intensely.

.70   I am concerned about intuitive ways of
       knowing and the nature of reality.

.68   I can generate highly original ideas and solutions.

.67   I form conceptual framework and use them.
.65   I devise systems or structures to think
       about concepts, 2nd my systems often conflict
       with those taught "by the book."

.65   I see unusual and diverse relationships
        among ideas and topics.

.64   I synthesize information comprehensively.

.64   I can conceptualize and see solutions for
        major societl problems.

.64   I question generalizations that others make.

.64   I am highly sensitive to the expectatins
        and feelings of others.

.60   I think flexibility, that is I can see many
        ways to solve a problem.

.59   I approach interesting tasks with high
        energy.

.58   I seemany alternatives, some of which are
        highly original or elaborate.

.56   Sometimes I feel great joy and enthusiasm.

.55   Othwers consider weird or strange my interest
        in phenomena that are outside the
        normal experience.

.55   I approach problems by analyzing possible
        causes and then generating alternatives.

.54   I feel outraged by unresolved human problems,
        like homelessness and poverty.

.54   I don't need immediate closure on a task or
        idea and keep "playing" with ideas to their
        logical conclusion.
.53   At times I feel compleeld to tak action.

.53   I have varied interests and am curius
        about range of topics.

```
.50      I derive satisfactorily by living up to my
         own standards; I don't need external validation
         of right or wrong.


.49      I live by personal values that others see as
         a challenge to authority or tradition.


Factor 2: Isolationism
.76      I become bored with mundane tasks.


.75      I often feel others don't understand me.
.72      I experience loneliness at depth taht few
         understand.


.67      I become frustrated by lack of challenge.


.67      When I am engaged in a task or project,
         I resent being interrupted.


.66      Others often don't understand my insight.


.64      I avoid difficult tasks by questioning their
         rationale or requirements.


.62      I have difficulty focusing on realistic goals
         for life's work.


.60      I become rebellious when I feel rejected.


.59      I am my own worst critic.


.59      I become impatient for others to understand
         a concept or instructions.


.59      I process information quickly.


.57      I have difficulty conforming to group tasks.


.57      Others percieve me as being too serious.
```

.55   I isolate myself, preferring to be or to work alone.

.55   Others don't understand or appreciate some of my insights.

.52   I often "think" in terms of nonverbal images (e.g., visual, auditory).

.51   I question my own behavior and actions.

Factor 3: Need for recognition

.77   I dominate discussions with knowledge and critical questions.

.68   Others consider me a "show off."

.57   I have difficulty accepting criticisms.

-.54   I react strongly to other's pain.

.53   I want my successes to be recognized.

Factor 4: Internal Motivation

.70   I vigorously pursue a problem or task until I complete it, even if it takes a long time.

.66   I am persistent and goal-directed.

-.66   I use humor in a critical or sarcastic way.

.64   I am strongly motivated to develop to my fullest potential.

-.62   Others view me as disrespectful to authority and tradition.

.58   I expect a great deal of myself.

.55   I have a need for succeess.

```
-.53    Others perceive me as stubborn, willful or
        uncooperativ.


Factor 5: Mind-Body Dichotomy


.79     I neglect my physical well being.


.62     I have a lrge vocabulary.


.59     I use language well.


.55     I refuse to take part in activities in which I
        don't excel.


-.54    I engage in vigorous physical activity to
        release emotional tension.


-.53    I experience emotiona "highs" that can
        barely find expression.


.51     I avoid physical activity.
```

REFERENCES

Clark. B. (1983). Growing up gifted (2nd ed.). Columbus: Charles E. Merrill.

Gallagher. J. J. (1990). Editorial: The public and professional perception of the emotional status of gifted children. Journal for the Education of the Gifted. 13(3). 202-21 1.

Gallagher. S. A. (1985). A comparison of the concept of over-excitabilioes with measures of creativity and school achievement in sixth-yrade students. Roeper Review, 115-119.

Kitano, M. K. (1990). Intellectual abilities and psychological intensities in young children: Implications for the gifted. Roeper Review 13(1) 5-10

Krueger, R.A. (1988). Focus groups: A practical guide for applied research. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Noble. K. D. (1987). The dilemma of the gifted woman. Psychology of Women Quarterly, 11. 367-378.

Noble. K. D. (1989). Counseling gifted women: Becoming the heroes of our own stories.

Journal for the Education of the Gifted 12 (2),131-141.

Piechowski. M. M. (1979). Developmental potential. In N. Colangelo & R. T. Zaffrann (Eds.). New voices in counseling the gifted (pp. 25-57). Dubuque. Iowa: Kendall/Hunt

Piechowski. M. M. (1986). The concept of developmental potential. Roeper Review 8 (3). 190-197.

Piechowski. M. M. (1991). Emotional development and emotional giftedness. In N. Colangelo & G. A. Davis (Eds.) Handbook of gifted education (pp. 285-306). Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Schiever. S. W. (1985). Creative personality characteristics and dimensions of mental functioning in gifted adolescent. Roeper Review 7 (4). 223-226.

Silverman. L. K. (1983). Issues in affective development of the gifted. In J. VanTassel-Baska (Ed.). A practical guide to counseling the gifted in a school setting (pp. 6-21). Reston. VA: The Council for Exceptional Children.

Silverman, L. K. (1990). Social end emotional education of the gifted The discoveries of Leta Hollingworth. Roeper Review 12(3J. 171-178.

Subotnik, R., Karp, D., & Morgan. E. (1989). High IQ children at midlife: An investigation into the generalizabilily of Terman s Genetic Studies of Genius. Roeper Review, 11(3). 139-144.

Terman. L. M. (Ed.). (1926). Genetic studies of genius, Vol. 1: Mental and physical traits of a thousand gifted children (2nd ed.). Stanford CA: Stanford University Press.

Terman, L. M. & Oden. M. H. (1947). Genetic studies of genius, Vol. 4: The gifted child grows up. Stanford, CA Stanford University Press.

Willings, D. (1985). The specific needs of adults who are gifted. Roeper Review 8 (1),35-38.

~~~~~~~~
By Rena B. Lewis , Margie K Kitano and Eleanor W. Lynch

Margie K. Kitano, Ph.D., is Associate Dean for Faculty Development and Research at the College of Education, San Diego State University, and Rena B. Lewis, Ph.D., and Eleanor W. Lynch, Ph.D., are Professors of Special Education at the same institution. Dr. Kitano's research interests include giftedness in traditionally underserved populations. she is co-author with D. F. Kirby of Gifted Education: A Comprehensive View. Dr. Lewis's work focuses on the use of technology in promoting achievement of students with school reaming problems; she is coauthor with D.H. Doorlag of Teaching Special Students in the Mainstream (3rd ea.) and with J.A. McLoughlin of Assessing Special Students (3rd). Dr. L,vnch's interests

include early intervention for infants and young children with disabilities and their families and the role of culture in educational programming; she is co-author with M. Hanson of Developing Cross-Cultural Competence: A guide for Working with Young Children and Their Families.