DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 234 531 EC 160 095

AUTHOR Mills, Carol J.
TITLE Personality Characteristics of Gifted Adolescents and Their Parents: Comparisons and Implications for Achievement and Counseling.
PUB DATE Apr 83
NOTE 24p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (Montreal, Quebec, Canada, April 11-14, 1983).
PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Reports - Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Adolescents; *Gifted; Interpersonal Competence; *Personality Traits; *Sex Differences

ABSTRACT

Personality characteristics were assessed for 65 male and 85 female gifted adolescents and their parents. Ss were enrolled in a college program for gifted students. The Myers-Briggs Type Indicator and the Adjective Checklist were used to describe personality patterns found in this group and to compare the gifted student to other populations. A set of personality characteristics that differed from other adolescent groups was found for the gifted students, although a diversity of types was found in the gifted population. Although the sexes were very similar in personality type, they differed in whether they preferred an interpersonal (females) versus an impersonal (males) orientation. Striking differences were found between personality preferences found for the gifted and those expressed by their parents. Personality was related to achievement for only the boys, with extroverted, thinking, judging types receiving higher grades in the college seminars. (Author/CL)

Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association - Montreal, April, 1983.

Personality Characteristics of Gifted Adolescents and Their Parents: Comparisons and Implications for Achievement and Counseling

Carol J. Mills, Franklin and Marshall College, P.O. Box 3003, Lancaster, PA 17604

Printed in U. S. A.

It is generally assumed that adolescents identified as "gifted" differ as a group from an average population of adolescents for both intellectual skills and personality characteristics. The personality differences are now beginning to be systematically investigated (e.g., Franks & Dolan, Mason & Blood, 1966; Tidwell, 1980; Tomlinson-Keasey & Smith-Winberry, 1983). Self-concept, adjustment, and a host of other personality/affective variables have been studied using a variety of measurement devices in an effort to separate gifted from non-gifted, gifted achieving from gifted underachieving, and gifted who receive intervention from gifted who do not. The present study looks at personality types associated with very basic personal preferences for interacting with the external world of people, ideas, and events. The Myers-Briggs Type Indicator, used in this study, is based on the theory that individual differences in human behavior are due to basic differences in the way people perceive the world around them and the processes they use to come to conclusions about their perceptions. Preference types have been shown to be related to interests, motivation, what people do best and what they prefer to do (Myers, 1962). In addition, preference types appear to differentiate gifted, creative, and high achieving groups from others.

The present study had the following objectives:

1. To examine the personality characteristics of a select group of gifted adolescents (7-10th grade) through the use of the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator (MBTI), an inventory assessing Jungian personality types, and the Adjective Checklist (ACL) as a check on the constructs provided by the MBTI. Differences among mathematically talented, verbally gifted, and those talented in both areas are also examined.

2. To compare the personality patterns found on the MBTI for this gifted group with other gifted adolescent groups, a group of "average" age-peers, a group of college students from a selective, private institution, and creative adults.

3. To examine the personality patterns found on the MBTI for the parents of the gifted adolescents, and assess the degree of similarity or difference. It is hoped that such an examination will suggest a developmental pattern or an environmental context within which certain personality characteristics associated with giftedness (or types of talent) might be nurtured. The results of such an examination may also have implications for family counseling with gifted students and their parents.

4. To investigate the relationship between personality characteristics, IQ scores, and achievement in a gifted program (assessed by grades in a college-level seminar).

5. To assess any sex differences in the above.

Based on past research (Burk, 1980; Mills, 1981; Myers, 1962), the literature on gifted adolescents, and Jung's theory of Psychological Types, it was predicted that the gifted adolescents in our sample would tend to prefer "intuition" (a preference for possibilities and relationships) over "sensing" (a preference for known facts). In addition, it was expected that they would more often be characterized as "perceptive" (flexible and spontaneous) than "judging" (planned, decided, orderly, responsible).

Subjects included 65 male and 87 female adolescents between the ages of 12 and 15 years who were enrolled in a college program for gifted students during the Fall of 1981, Spring 1982, and Fall 1982. All subjects had IQ scores greater than 130 and had scored at the 98th percentile or higher on a standardized ability or achievement test. Selection for the Program, however, was based on SAT scores

and/or demonstrated talent where appropriate, teacher recommendations, and a student essay. A wide range of topics is represented in the Program and, therefore, a wide range of talents can be found in participants. Although most statistical analyses are done across all "types" of giftedness, students are divided into a mathematically gifted, verbally gifted, and balanced group to investigate differences in personality. Mothers (140) and fathers (124) of most students participated by completing the same personality inventories as completed by their sons and daughters.

Comparative Samples: Several comparison groups were used to help understand the gifted students' scores on the MBTI:

1. A 1962 group of 7th-9th grade gifted students (Myers, 1962) from special classes in suburban public school system all of which ranked at the 95th percentile or higher on all achievement tests taken.

2. Pre-prep 7th and 8th graders from Swarthmore High School (Myers, 1962). The mean IQ for 8th graders was 114. This group constituted an age-appropriate peer group with a more "average" IQ composition.

3. National Merit Scholarship finalists (all males) from the Spring of 1960 (Myers, 1962) made up an age-appropriate peer group with a comparable IQ composition.

4. Franklin and Marshall College freshmen for the years 1976-77 (381 women and 596 men) were used for an above-age level peer group of above average to high IQ.

5. Creative men and women consisting of 40 architects, 30 research scientists, 20 writers, 43 mathematicians, 3 writers and 10 college seniors (Myers, 1962) were chosen as a comparison group on the dimension of creativity, demonstrated accomplishment, and for comparison with the parents of the gifted.

Instruments. A battery of personality and interest inventories were completed by students and parents. Included was the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator (MBTI), a self-report, forced-choice inventory of preferences in regard to perception and judgement. The purpose of the Indicator is to implement Jung's Theory of Type by ascertaining a person's basic preference for either extraversion (preference for the outer world of people and things) or introversion (preference for the inner world of ideas), sensing (preference for facts) or intuiting (preference for possibilities and relationships), thinking (impersonal analysis and logic) or feeling (personal values and judgments), and judging (preference for planned, orderly, decided way of life) or perceiving (preference for a flexible, spontaneous way of life).

The MBTI was scored for: (a) preference scores for each of the four dichotomies (EI, SN, TF, JP) along with a letter showing the direction of the preference; (b) continuous scores; and (c) personality type based on the 16 possible combinations of the EI, SN, TF, JP dimensions. Percentage and means for preference on each of the four opposing pairs, as well as percentages for each of the 16 personality types, were computed separately for males and females.

The Adjective Checklist (ACL) is a set of 300 self-descriptive adjectives each of which a person can check off or leave blank. From this set of adjectives, a number of different scales can be scored. For this study, the following 13 scales were scored: Self-confidence, Self-Control, Lability, Personal Adjustment, Achievement, Dominance, Endurance, Order, Intraception, Affiliation, Autonomy, Abasement, and Deference.

Several IQ measures were reported for our sample (since this was not a measure used for selection). Several subsets of subjects were formed for the three most frequently-reported tests and separate analyses were performed on each set. Grades in a college-level course were available for each participant. SAT scores were also available, and subjects were divided on the basis of SAT

scores into 3 groups: math talent, verbal talent, or both. Classification was based on a 75 point or greater difference between SAT-V and M.

Results and Discussion

MBTI Preferences

Table 1 shows the percentages for preferences on the four dimensions of the MBTI for our gifted group, as well as parents and other comparison groups. Our male gifted students were equally as likely to be introverts as extraverts. A significant preference, however, emerged for intuiting over sensing, thinking over feeling, and perceiving over judging. Our female gifted group was equally as likely to be split between introverts and extraverts, and showed just as strong a preference for intuiting over sensing. They differed from their male counterparts, however, in two provocative ways -- they were equally divided between thinking and feeling, and between judging and perceiving.

The gifted group, therefore, can be characterized as very similar to an average group of adolescents in that some are socially outgoing and extraverted, while some are more introspective and withdrawn. They clearly show a preference, however, for looking at the world in terms of possibilities and relationships rather than relying on facts alone. The sex differences appear to reflect differing socialization pressures and expectations for the two sexes. Namely, males are socialized to use their intellect in an objective, logical, analytical mode, distrusting feelings or subjectivity, thus they show a strong preference for the thinking mode. Females, on the other hand, may feel more comfortable with the feeling mode, and thus are equally as likely to choose thinking or feeling as a preferred mode, according to personal preference.

The gifted boys clearly prefer perceiving over judging. Perceivers are flexible, spontaneous, independent, autonomous individuals who are not very accepting of rules, deadlines, and order. This certainly matches the "stereotype" of the gifted adolescent. It also taps into one of the strengths, as well

as one of the problem areas, for gifted students. The girls, on the other hand, are more evenly split on this preference. This raises several issues. It suggests that less gifted girls than boys should be seen as "problem" students, and less of them should be labeled underachievers. At the same time, have a significant number of these women "lost" their autonomy, independence, and spontaneity?

In comparison to other groups, the males in our group were most like the National Merit Scholarship finalists and the 1962 gifted group. They were least like the pre-prep group, the F&M students, and their own parents (except for the strong match with their fathers on the thinking preference). In comparison to the group of creative men, less of our gifted males were introverted. The pattern for S-N, T-F, and J-P, however, was the same; less exaggerated for thinking over feeling and perceiving over judging. One of the more interesting and yet disturbing findings for this group was the oppositional pattern on S-N and J-P for their parents.

The gifted girls were most like other gifted girls and F&M women. They more often preferred intuiting over sensing than the pre-prep group (who had exactly the opposite pattern of preference), and they showed a smaller percentage of extraverts. They looked about the same as this more average group on the thinking-feeling and judging-perceiving dimensions. They, like the boys, were less introverted than the creative women and the S-N split was less exaggerated. Also, like the boys, they showed oppositional patterns on the S-N and J-P dimensions when compared to their parents. On the thinking-feeling dimension, the pattern for boys was strikingly like their fathers and significantly different from their mothers; the pattern for girls was very much like their mothers and significantly different from their fathers.

Table 2 shows the personality types resulting from the four preference combinations for both male and female gifted students and their parents. The types are listed in the order of highest to lowest representation for each group, with the percentage of individuals for each type in parentheses.

The majority of both gifted females (64%) and gifted males (66%) were represented in five types: extraverted, intuitive, perceptive thinkers (ENTP) and feelers (ENFP); introverted, intuitive, perceptive, thinkers (INTP) and feelers (INFP); and introverted, sensing, judging, thinkers (ISTJ). For the gifted males, there was some overlap with their fathers in that the 1st and 3rd most represented group for fathers was the 2nd and 3rd most represented for their sons. Only one of the top four types for the mothers overlapped with their sons (ISTJ). The most heavily represented type for gifted males (ENTP), however, had no fathers or mothers in it.

The mothers and fathers of gifted females were very similar to the parents of gifted males, but very unlike their daughters. The most heavily represented type for gifted girls (ENFP) was found for only 4% of their fathers and 1% of their mothers. One of the striking differences was found on the judging-perceiving dimension where the top six groups of mothers for gifted boys and the top five groups of mothers for gifted girls were judging types. The students, on the other hand, were perceiving types, 3 to 1, in the top four types. Fathers were more evenly split with half of the top four types judging and half perceiving.

The differences between students and their parents can be clearly seen in the percentages of matches between student and parent personality type: 5% each for male and female students with their fathers, 8% with mothers.

MBTI Differences for Subgroups

The verbally gifted subgroup was spread over 10 MBTI types. The largest group of verbally gifted was the extraverted, intuiting, feeling, perceiving

type (ENFP) (26%). Three other types were represented by 11% each: INTP, ENTP, and INFP for a total of 59% of the verbally gifted. It is noteworthy that this group was equally split between introverts and extraverts, thinkers and feelers, but all were intuitives and perceivers. Seventy-six percent of the math gifted group was split between five personality types: ENTP (28%), ESTJ (14%), INTP (9%), INFP (9%), and ISTJ (16%). Again, the group was split between introverts and extraverts. This group, however, was split between sensing and intuiting, but was overwhelmingly perceivers and thinkers. The balanced group was a mixture of the types preferred by verbally and mathematically gifted.

The fact that intuiting is preferred for the verbally gifted more than for the math gifted is understandable since NF persons (37% of the verbally gifted) are insightful and creative, with a marked gift for language (Myers, 1962); they quite often excel in writing. NT's (22% of the verbally gifted and 37% of the math gifted) tend to be intellectually ingenious, excelling in language and mathematics. Sensing thinkers (absent for the verbally gifted, but 30% of the math gifted) prefer impersonal, logical analyses, excelling in economics and computer science. "Perceiving" is apparently a strong preference for most of the gifted, regardless of their type of talent.

Table 3 presents correlations between gifted students and their parents' continuous scores on the four MBTI dimensions. Both gifted females and males had EI scores that were significantly related to their father's EI scores. For the boys, all three of the remaining dimensions were significantly related to their mother's scores. For girls, only SN scores were significantly related to their parents' scores (both mothers and fathers).

Adjective Checklist

Table 4 presents the 13 scales from the ACL with a short description for high and low scorers, and mean standard scores of our group (based on general population norms). In general, the ACL strongly supported the constructs underlying the MBTI dimensions. As a group, the gifted were low on Self-Control, tending to be rebellious and argumentative, low on Order, tending to be absent-minded, unorganized, preferring complexity and variety to order. They also (especially the males) were low on Personal Adjustment, tending to be dissatisfied, moody, and withdrawn. It is interesting that Tomlinson-Keasey & Smith-Winberry (1983) also found gifted males to be less well-adjusted than their control counterparts. The group was overall also low on Intraception, Affiliation, and Deference, tending to be opinionated and fault-finding, individualistic and strong-willed, spontaneous and independent.

Table 5 presents the four MBTI dimensions and the ACL scales that were significantly correlated with each. Since the majority of our gifted students prefer intuition and perceiving, it was no surprise to find them described by the ACL as: autonomous, flexible, capable, aggressive, spontaneous, and tolerant. They can also be seen as temperamental, unorganized, rebellious, argumentative, impatient, moody, absent-minded, energetic, careless, independent, and preferring complexity, variety, and change. Seventy-seven per cent of our gifted boys preferred the thinking mode for making judgments or decisions. That means they do so objectively and impersonally, considering causes of events and where decisions may lead. According to the ACL, they are opinionated, autonomous, self-confident, argumentative, dissatisfied, independent, ambitious, and precise. More females than males preferred the feeling mode, where decisions are made personally and subjectively, weighing

values of choices and how they matter to others. On the ACL, the sexes had significant differences in mean scores on four scales: Affiliation (females higher) $t(138) = -2.38$, $p < .02$, Autonomy (males higher) $t(138) = 2.23$, $p < .02$, Abasement (females higher) $t(138) = -2.64$, $p < .01$, and Deference (females higher) $t(138) = -1.83$, $p < .05$. These differences reflect widely-found and traditional differences between the sexes. They also reflect, I believe, the differences found on the thinking-feeling dimension of the MBTI.

Personality and Achievement

No differences in IQ were found for the two sexes or any of the personality categories (EI, SN, TF, JP). IQ was also unrelated to grade in the gifted seminars. A sex x personality type interaction for grade, however was found for introversion-extraversion, $F(1,101) = 4.16$, $p < .05$, with male extraverts having significantly higher grades than female extraverts and introverts, and higher than male introverts. No difference was found for female introverts versus extraverts. The same significant interaction occurred for judging versus perceiving, $F(1,101) = 4.47$, $p < .05$, with male judgers having significantly higher grades than male perceivers, female judgers, and female perceivers. Again, the female types did not differ. For males, grades were negatively correlated ($r = -.55$) with their feeling scores. In other words, males with a feeling preference, the stronger the preference the lower the grades obtained.

General Discussion

It must be kept in mind that the present sample is a "select" group of gifted adolescents and, therefore, the results of this study cannot be applied to all gifted students. The students in our Program were chosen for certain affective, as well as intellectual qualities. The unmotivated, unachieving gifted were under-represented, although not completely absent in this group.

The finding of a relatively stable (across time and population) set of personality characteristics for gifted groups that differs from other adolescent groups is of major importance in the understanding of these individuals, their cognitive styles, preferences for perceiving and evaluating the world around them. The present results suggest that the same qualities (flexibility, ingenuity, theoretical orientation, insight) are found in gifted males and females, but that the sexes differ somewhat in whether they use their qualities within an interpersonal versus an impersonal orientation (a difference perhaps related to the differing socialization of males and females since this difference is consistently found in the general population). This knowledge can be used to counsel educators concerning the characteristics and learning styles of gifted adolescents as they differ from other groups of adolescents.

On the other hand, it is important to recognize the diversity of types found within the gifted population. The successes and problems encountered by the extraverted gifted student most likely differ from those experienced by the introverted one, the judging versus the perceiving, and the thinkers versus feelers. The differences found for varying types of giftedness (math versus verbal) emphasize the interaction between personality and intellectual characteristics; with some preferences unique to gifted types and others that are indigenous to being gifted without regard to type of intellectual talent. Teachers, counselors, and parents of the gifted should be aware of these differences for educational intervention, as well as social and academic counseling. A more sophisticated understanding and identification of the many manifestations of giftedness is sorely needed. For too long we have treated the gifted as a completely homogeneous group, whereas they are anything but in terms of intellectual level or personality.

It is clear that more than ability contributes to high level achievement. Certainly motivation is important, and it seems as plausible that preferences for perceiving and evaluating information, situations, and solving problems can affect academic outcomes. Traditional educational approaches with an emphasis on facts, routine, and detail quite likely conflict with the majority of gifted children's interest in possibilities, theories, ideas, spontaneity, and imagination. The fact that extraverted and judging males (there were only 10 of these) received higher grades than other types can be understood in terms of these traditional educational values. Judging types have been found to be high achievers (somewhat overachievers) before (Myers, 1962) and no wonder. They are described as thorough, responsible, dependable, performs up to capacity, meets deadlines, industrious, good on details. Extraverted males are described as competitive, acting gregarious, potential leaders, pleasant, and expresses self well -- again characteristics valued in most traditional educational systems. Extraverted males also received higher grades than other groups. Perceivers, on the other hand, are described as unwilling to take directions and uncooperative. They, more likely, are going to be at risk for "behavioral problems" and underachievement. Indeed, Myers (1962) reports a significant negative relationship between achievement and a preference for perceiving versus judging.

Personality does not appear to be as critical a factor for achievement in females. This may be due to the fact that their stronger preference for feeling (a people orientation) over thinking (an impersonal attitude) offsets some of qualities found in the introverted and perceiving types that are least amenable to educational values. In addition, girls have been found to be more cooperative and "socialized" to "school" than boys. This is an area needing future research.

A curriculum for gifted students should capitalize on the strengths and preferences of such youth (flexibility, independence, theoretical orientation, good with abstract ideas), as well as incorporate experiences to exercise the skills/processes least preferred and developed by gifted students (organization, thoroughness, attention to details). Of course, individual assessment and curriculum planning should be the ideal. However, when this is not possible, knowledge of the dominant preferences of the majority of gifted students (or groups of gifted students) will contribute to better educational planning.

Studies have shown that a number of gifted individuals suffer from depression (Yadusky-Holahan & Holahan, 1983) and low self-esteem (Klein and Cantor, 1976). In fact, one of the major differences between achieving and underachieving gifted individuals is a poor self-concept. An important factor contributing to both psychological, as well as academic, problems may be the personality preferences found in a significant number of gifted students that differ from that of most of their classmates, many of their teachers, and even their parents. It is very difficult for judging and sensing types to understand intuiting and perceiving types, and yet these opposing patterns are found for gifted adolescents and their parents. It is intriguing to consider the dynamics involved in the development of such diverse patterns for students as compared to their parents. It is clear, however, that the knowledge that such differences exist can lead to a greater understanding between parents and their gifted children.

TABLE 1

Percentages for Preference Scores on the MBTI

	MALES	E	I	S	N	T	F	J	P
	1962 Gifted (34) (7th-9th grade)	50	50	21	79	56[e]	44[f]	38	62
	National Merit Scholarship finalists	42	58	17	83	66	34	43	57
**	Our Gifted (64) (7th-10th grade)	55[a]	45[b]	33[c]	67[d]	77[e]	23[f]	27[g]	73[h]
	Pre-Prep (100) (7th-8th grade)	68	32	72[c]	28[d]	56[e]	44[f]	49[g]	51[h]
	Franklin and Marshall Freshmen (596)	47	53	49[c]	51[d]	40[e]	60[f]	57[g]	43[h]
	Creative Men (115)	37[a]	63[b]	3[c]	97[d]	59[e]	41[f]	45[g]	55[h]
	Mothers (59)	37[a]	63[b]	63[c]	37[d]	48[e]	52[f]	75[g]	25[h]
	Fathers (51)	37[a]	63[b]	60[c]	40[d]	82	18	57[g]	43[h]
	FEMALES								
	1962 Gifted (26) (7th-9th grade)	58	42	12[c]	88[d]	42	58	35	65
**	Our Gifted (83) (7th-10th grade)	57[a]	43[b]	31[c]	69[d]	42[e]	58[f]	45[g]	55[h]
	Pre-prep (121) (7th-8th grade)	75[a]	25[b]	70[c]	30[d]	41	59	47	53
	Franklin and Marshall Freshmen Women (381)	52	48	39[c]	61[d]	28[e]	72[f]	52	48
	Creative Women (28)	21[a]	79[b]	4	96	43	57	36	64
	Mothers (81)	39[a]	61[b]	54[c]	46[d]	38	62	70[g]	30[h]
	Fathers (73)	30[a]	70[b]	56[c]	44[d]	80[e]	20[f]	63[g]	37[h]

Note: Comparison groups with the same superscript differ significantly from Our Gifted Group for the percentages found in each column - Test for the Difference in Proportions (z) $p < .05$

TABLE 2

Personality Types Resulting From the Four Preference Combinations on the MBTI

Male Gifted	Fathers	Mothers	Female Gifted	Fathers	Mothers
ENTP* (28%)	ISTJ (22%)	ISTJ (19%)	ENFP* (22%)	ISTJ (34%)	ISFJ (19%)
INTP (19%)	ESTP (18%)	ISFJ (12%)	INFP (19%)	INTJ (14%)	ESFJ (9%)
ISTJ (8%)	INTP (14%)	ESFJ (12%)	ENTP (10%)	INTP (8%)	ENFJ (9%)
INFP (8%)	INTJ (12%)	INTJ (10%)	ISTJ (9%)	ENTP (6%)	ISTJ (7%)
ENTJ (6%)	ESTJ (12%)	INFJ (8%)	INFJ (8%)	INFP (5%)	INFJ (7%)
INTJ (6%)	ISFJ (4%)	ESTJ (7%)	ESTJ (5%)	ESTJ (5%)	INFP (7%)
ISTP (6%)	INFJ (4%)	ISFP (5%)	ENFJ (5%)	ENTJ (5%)	ISFP (6%)
ESFP (3%)	INFP (4%)	ENFP (5%)	ISFJ (4%)	ISTP (4%)	ESTJ (6%)
ENFP (3%)	ENTJ (4%)	ENFJ (5%)	INTP (4%)	ESFP (4%)	ENTJ (6%)
ESTJ (3%)	ISTP (2%)	INFP (3%)	ESFP (4%)	ENFP* (4%)	INTP (4%)
ESFJ (3%)	ESFP (2%)	INTP (3%)	ENTJ (4%)	ISFJ (3%)	ESFP (4%)
ISFJ (2%)	ENFP (2%)	ISTP (1%)	INTJ (3%)	ISFP (3%)	ENTP (4%)
ISFP (2%)	ENFJ 0	ESTP (1%)	ISTP (1%)	ESTP (3%)	ISTP (2%)
ESTP (1%)	ENTP* 0	ENTJ (1%)	ESTP (1%)	ESFJ (1%)	ESTP (1%)
ENFJ (1%)	ESFJ 0	ENTP* 0	ESFJ (1%)	INFJ 0	ENFP* (1%)
INFJ 0	ISFP 0	ESFP 0	ISFP 0	ENFJ 0	INTJ 0

CHARACTERISTICS FREQUENTLY ASSOCIATED WITH EACH TYPE AMONG YOUNG PEOPLE

Male H.S. Norms

Our Gifted Male;Female

	SENSING TYPES		INTUITIVE TYPES	
INTROVERTS	**ISTJ** 8.1% Serious, quiet, earn success by concentration and thoroughness. Practical, orderly, matter-of-fact, logical, realistic and dependable. See to it that everything is well organized. Take responsibility. Make up their own minds as to what should be accomplished and work toward it steadily, regardless of protests or distractions. 8% 9%	**ISFJ** 4.0% Quiet, friendly, responsible and conscientious. Work devotedly to meet their obligations and serve their friends and school. Thorough, painstaking, accurate. May need time to master technical subjects, as their interests are usually not technical. Patient with detail and routine. Loyal, considerate, concerned with how other people feel. 2% 4%	**INFJ** 2.1% Succeed by perseverance, originality and desire to do whatever is needed or wanted. Put their best efforts into their work. Quietly forceful, conscientious, concerned for others. Respected for their firm principles. Likely to be honored and followed for their clear convictions as to how best to serve the common good. 0 8%	**INTJ** 4.7% Usually have original minds and great drive for their own ideas and purposes. In fields that appeal to them, they have a fine power to organize a job and carry it through with or without help. Skeptical, critical, independent, determined, often stubborn. Must learn to yield less important points in order to win the most important. 6% 3%
	ISTP 5.1% Cool onlookers—quiet, reserved, observing and analyzing life with detached curiosity and unexpected flashes of original humor. Usually interested in impersonal principles, cause and effect, how and why mechanical things work. Exert themselves no more than they think necessary, because any waste of energy would be inefficient. 6% 1%	**ISFP** 4.4% Retiring, quietly friendly, sensitive, kind, modest about their abilities. Shun disagreements, do not force their opinions or values on others. Usually do not care to lead but are often loyal followers. Often relaxed about getting things done, because they enjoy the present moment and do not want to spoil it by undue haste or exertion. 2% 0%	**INFP** 4.2% Full of enthusiasms and loyalties, but seldom talk of these until they know you well. Care about learning, ideas, language, and independent projects of their own. Tend to undertake too much, then somehow get it done. Friendly, but often too absorbed in what they are doing to be sociable. Little concerned with possessions or physical surroundings. 8% 19%	**INTP** 6.0% Quiet, reserved, brilliant in exams, especially in theoretical or scientific subjects. Logical to the point of hair-splitting. Usually interested mainly in ideas, with little liking for parties or small talk. Tend to have sharply defined interests. Need to choose careers where some strong interest can be used and useful. 19% 4%
EXTRAVERTS	**ESTP** 7.7% Matter-of-fact, do not worry or hurry, enjoy whatever comes along. Tend to like mechanical things and sports, with friends on the side. May be a bit blunt or insensitive. Can do math or science when they see the need. Dislike long explanations. Are best with real things that can be worked, handled, taken apart or put together. 1% 1%	**ESFP** 6.4% Outgoing, easygoing, accepting, friendly, enjoy everything and make things more fun for others by their enjoyment. Like sports and making things. Know what's going on and join in eagerly. Find remembering facts easier than mastering theories. Are best in situations that need sound common sense and practical ability with people as well as with things. 3% 4%	**ENFP** 7.1% Warmly enthusiastic, high spirited, ingenious, imaginative. Able to do almost anything that interests them. Quick with a solution for any difficulty and ready to help anyone with a problem. Often rely on their ability to improvise instead of preparing in advance. Can usually find compelling reasons for whatever they want. 3% 22%	**ENTP** 7.9% Quick, ingenious, good at many things. Stimulating company, alert and outspoken. May argue for fun on either side of a question. Resourceful in solving new and challenging problems, but may neglect routine assignments. Apt to turn to one new interest after another. Skillful in finding logical reasons for what they want. 28% 10%
	ESTJ 15.7% Practical, realistic, matter-of-fact, with a natural head for business or mechanics. Not interested in subjects they see no use for, but can apply themselves when necessary. Like to organize and run activities. May make good administrators, especially if they remember to consider others' feelings and points of view. 3% 5%	**ESFJ** 6.5% Warm-hearted, talkative, popular, conscientious, born cooperators, active committee members. Need harmony and may be good at creating it. Always doing something nice for someone. Work best with encouragement and praise. Little interest in abstract thinking or technical subjects. Main interest is in things that directly and visibly affect people's lives. 3% 1%	**ENFJ** 3.5% Responsive and responsible. Generally feel real concern for what others think or want, and try to handle things with due regard for other people's feelings. Can present a proposal or lead a group discussion with ease and tact. Sociable, popular, active in school affairs, but put time enough on their studies to do good work. 1% 5%	**ENTJ** 6.6% Hearty, frank, able in studies, leaders in activities. Usually good in anything that requires reasoning and intelligent talk, such as public speaking. Are usually well-informed and enjoy adding to their fund of knowledge. May sometimes be more positive and confident than their experience in an area warrants. 6% 4%

TABLE 3

Pearson Correlations for Gifted Students and Their Parents on the MBTI

Dimensions	Gifted Males/Father	Mother	Gifted Females/Father	Mother
EI	.36**	.12	.24*	.09
SN	.06	.36**	.28**	.35**
TF	-.01	.24*	.09	-.03
JP	.07	.22*	.13	.09

* $p < .05$

** $p < .01$

TABLE 4

ACL Scales, Descriptions and Mean Standard Scores

Scale	Description	Mean Standard Score
Self-Confidence	Hi = Poised, self-confident, self-assured, clear-thinking, independent, outspoken.	Males 49
	Lo = Retiring, reserved, pre-occupied, preferring inaction and contemplation.	Females 49
Self-Control	Hi = Conscientious, dependable, goodnatured, industrious, stable, and pleasant.	Males 42
	Lo = Adventurous, hasty, rebellious, and argumentative.	Females 45
Lability	Hi = Spontaneous, flexible, need for change, emotional, impatient, tolerant, forgetful.	Males 57
	Lo = Conservative, formal, industrious, serious, unselfish.	Females 50
Personal Adjustment	Hi = alert, calm, fair-minded, loyal, organized, practical, trusting.	Males 43
	Lo = affected, dissatisfied, moody, aloof, and withdrawn.	Females 47
Achievement	Hi = aggressive, ambitious, capable, energetic, opportunistic, and planful.	Males 49
	Lo = easygoing, leisurely, skeptical, and dubious about rewards due to effort.	Females 49
Dominance	Hi = aggressive, argumentative, autocratic, forceful, outgoing, strong.	Males 50
	Lo = inhibited, retiring, shy, suggestible.	Females 52
Endurance	Hi = determined, methodical, patient, persevering, precise, and steady.	Males 47
	Lo = absent-minded, hasty, impulsive, careless.	Females 47
Order	Hi = neat, organized, rational, formal, cautious, conservative.	Males 44
	Lo = absent-minded, unorganized, temperamental, prefer complexity and variety to order.	Females 43
Intraception	Hi = alert, curious, insightful, relective, sensitive.	Males 44
	Lo = indifferent, opinionated, and fault-finding.	Females 45

Scale	Description	Mean Standard Score
Affiliation	Hi = adaptable, considerate, cooperative, kind, talkative, and warm. Lo = individualistic and strong-willed, less trusting.	Males 43 Females 42
Autonomy	Hi = independent, autonomous, assertive, and self-willed. Lo = subdued, hesitates to take the initiative.	Males 50 Females 55
Abasement	Hi = anxious, gloomy, and submissive. Lo = optimistic and confident.	Males 46 Females 46
Deference	Hi = appreciative, conventional, cooperative, sensitive, suggestible. Lo = energetic, spontaneous, and independent.	Males 43 Females 43

TABLE 5

Correlations Between MBTI Dimensions and ACL Scales

ACL Scale	MBTI EI	SN	TF	JP
Self-Confidence	-.47***	.36**	-.26*	.15
Self-Control	.15	-.32**	.12	-.46***
Lability	-.35***	.52***	.10	.38***
Personal Adjustment	-.12	-.12	.30**(males) -.06(females)	-.32**
Achievement	-.15	.17	-.27**	-.12
Dominance	-.52***	.15	-.34**	-.05
Endurance	.05	-.27**	-.28**(females) .05 (males)	-.47***
Order	-.06	-.28**	-.24**(females) .01 (males)	-.50***
Intraception	.06	.18	.25**(males) .04 (females)	-.10
Affiliation	-.33**	.14	.35***(males) .02(females)	-.12
Autonomy	-.34**	.35***	-.40***(males) .01 (females)	.41***
Abasement	.51***	-.19	.41***	-.25**
Deference	.41***	-.34**	.46***(males) .13 (females)	-.44

* $p < .05$ ** $p < .01$ *** $p < .001$

Abstract

Personality characteristics were assessed for 65 male and 87 female adolescents (and their parents) between the ages of 12 and 15 years of age who were enrolled in a college program for gifted students. The Myers-Briggs Type Indicator (MBTI) and the Adjective Checklist (ACL) were used to describe the personality patterns found in this group and to compare the gifted students to other populations. A set of personality characteristics that differed from other adolescent groups was found for the gifted students, although a diversity of types was found in the gifted population. Although the sexes were very similar in personality type, they differed in whether they preferred an interpersonal (females) versus an impersonal (males) orientation. Striking differences were found between the personality preferences found for the gifted and those expressed by their parents. Personality was related to achievement for only the boys, with extraverted, thinking, judging types receiving higher grades in the college seminars.