level expectations, which prevents them from being detected as learning-disabled or qualifying for special education services. Catch 22! In our zeal to compute "averages" of people's abilities, giftedness and handicaps cancel each other out, leaving these children to appear "average."

The information in this article was gleaned from the clinical analysis of 1400 test protocols at the Gifted Child Development Center over the past ten years. My Ph.D. in learning disabilities enables me to discern patterns in gifted children resembling the subtle scatter seen in profiles of learning-disabled youngsters.

Underachiever or Learning-disabled?

The most fertile ground for unearthing learning-disabled gifted children is among underachievers. Tannebaum (1983) likens underachievement to a skin rash, since its description tells nothing of its cause. A review of the literature supports the wisdom of his metaphor. The following list of characteristics of underachievers, from Joanne Whitmore's (1980) classic text, Giftedness, Conflict and Underachievement, aptly describes the majority of underachieving gifted children:

- Perfectionistic Supersensitive
- Lacks social skills
- Socially isolated
- Has unrealistic self-expectations
- Low in self-esteem
- Hyperactive
- Distractible
- Has psychomotor inattention
- Chronically inattentive
- Frustrated by the demands of the classroom
- Fails to complete assignments
- Excessively critical of self and others
- Rebellious against drill and excessive repetition
- Disparaging of the work they are required to do
- Become "an expert" in one area and dominate discussions with their expertise

If you take a second look at this list, we discover an interesting paradox: studies of learning-disabled gifted children (cited in parentheses) have produced an identical set of characteristics.

Perfectionistic (Rosner & Seymour, 1983)


Lacks social skills (Baldwin & Gargiulo, 1983; Osman, 1979)

Socially isolated (Schiff, Kaufman & Kaufman, 1981)

Has unrealistic self-expectations (Maker, 1977; Wolf & Gygí, 1981)

Low in self-esteem (Daniels, 1983; Pendarvis & Grossi, 1980; Schiff, Kaufman & Kaufman, 1981)

Hyperactive (Tannebaum & Baldwin, 1983)

Distractible (Schiff, Kaufman & Kaufman, 1981; Tannebaum & Baldwin, 1983)

Has psychomotor inefficiency (Rosner, 1983; Schiff, Kaufman & Kaufman, 1981)

Chronically inattentive (Tannebaum & Baldwin, 1983)

Frustrated by the demands of the classroom (Tannebaum & Baldwin, 1983)

Fails to complete assignments (Tannebaum & Baldwin, 1983)


Rebellious against drill and excessive repetition (Tannebaum & Baldwin, 1983)

Disparaging of the work they are required to do (Tannebaum & Baldwin, 1983)

Become "an expert" in one area and dominate discussions with their expertise (Rosner & Seymour, 1983; Tannebaum & Baldwin, 1983)

The lists of key characteristics of learning-disabled gifted children and gifted underachievers derived from various studies are virtually identical. This may seem less surprising when one realizes that both populations have been identified through discrepancies between performance on measures of aptitude and achievement, and thus the groups overlap. The significant question is, when we are looking at a student who won't do the work, how do we know we aren't actually dealing with a child who can't do the work? Too often adults have been quick to misjudge these children as simply "lazy," a label damaging to their self-esteem and less than helpful in determining the actual cause and potential solution to the problem.

Every underachieving child deserves a thorough diagnostic battery by a qualified diagnostician to determine if there is any evidence of learning disabilities. This does not imply that all underachievers should be served in special education; on the contrary, most can be served in regular or gifted classrooms with a few modifications of instructional strategies. But those modifications are...
The structure of the manuscript is organized into sections. The first section introduces the research question and outlines the methodology. It is followed by a discussion of the results, which are then compared with existing literature. The conclusions are drawn from these comparisons, and suggestions for future research are outlined. The appendix contains additional material that supplements the main text.
The diagram above illustrates the correct way to fold a letter. The text explains the steps in detail:

1. Open the letter and unfold it completely.
2. Fold the top part of the letter inwards, aligning the top edge with the bottom edge of the letter.
3. Fold the bottom part of the letter inwards, aligning the bottom edge with the top edge of the letter.
4. Press along the folds to crease the letter.

This method ensures that the letter is neatly folded and easy to mail.
Identification of Giftedness in Severely and Profoundly Hearing Impaired Students

Carolyn R. Yewechn
Mary Ann Bibby

Nonverbal measures of IQ, teacher nominations and parent nominations were used to identify giftedness among severely and profoundly hearing-impaired students enrolled in a school for the deaf or a public school system. It was found that while teachers and parents tended to nominate the same students, both groups of nominators missed some intellectually gifted students. On the whole, no statistical correlation was found among the three identification procedures. Hearing-impaired children were judged to exhibit characteristics of giftedness very similar to those of their hearing peers, with the exception of academic achievement.
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