

The Comparison of the Social Skills, Problem Behaviours and Academic Competence of Gifted Students and Their Non-gifted Peers

Mahmut Çitilⁱ
Gazi University

Ufuk Özkubatⁱⁱ
Gazi University

Abstract

The purpose of this study is to compare the social skills, problem behaviours and academic competence of gifted students at elementary level with their non-gifted peers, and to assess these based on the variables age, gender, and school year. The study group consists of 50 gifted students in second, third and fourth grade in state schools in Ankara in the 2017- 2018 school year and their 50 non-gifted peers. In order to obtain data for the study, The Social Skills Rating Scale Teacher Form was used which developed by Gresham and Elliot (1990) and translated into Turkish by Sucuoğlu and Özokçu (2005) has been used. The data has been analysed using the SPSS 22.00 software package. Descriptive statistics have been used for data analysis. According to the results of the study, it was observed that the social skills levels and the academic competence levels of the gifted students were statistically more developed compared to their non-gifted peers. On the other hand, it was observed that there was no difference between gifted students and their non-gifted peers in terms of problem behaviours. In this study, no significant difference was found in the academic competence levels of gifted students according to gender. It was found out in the study that 10-year old students display more problem behaviours in comparison to their 9-year old peers. There was no meaningful difference in the social skills and academic competence of gifted students based on the variable school year. Although the results of this study present that gifted students have better social skills and academic competence, and display less problem behaviours compared to their peers, further research needs to be conducted to clarify this situation.

Keywords: Social Skills, Academic Competence, Problem Behaviours, Giftedness

DOI: 10.29329/ijpe.2020.280.18

ⁱ **Mahmut Çitil**, Assist. Prof., Special Education, Gazi University, Gazi Faculty of Education, ORCID: 0000-0001-7607-6595

Correspondence: mcitil@gazi.edu.tr

ⁱⁱ **Ufuk Özkubat**, Dr., Special Education, Gazi University, Gazi Faculty of Education, ORCID: 0000-0002-9626-5112

INTRODUCTION

Researchers have been trying to understand, explain and assess gifted individuals for nearly a hundred years (Subotnik, Olszewski-Kubilius, & Worrell, 2011). A major part of these studies have been conducted to understand the social and emotional aspects of gifted individuals (Cross & Cross, 2017; Merrell & Gill, 1994). Does being gifted also mean having an extraordinary potential or performance socially and emotionally? Answers have been sought to this question since the beginning of such research. Ideas on whether gifted individuals are stronger or weaker socially or emotionally than other people have changed over time (Ogurlu, Yalın, & Birben, 2018). From the 1980s onwards, the experts in the field have dealt with the issue more than ever before to clarify this situation. For instance, Child (1981) compared the adaptive behaviour of 5-year old gifted and non-gifted children and found out that gifted students displayed higher adaptive behaviour scores than non-gifted students (Douthitt, 1992). During the 1990s, a lot of research was conducted to determine the social and emotional conditions of gifted children and their comparison to their peers (Delisle, 1990; Douthitt, 1992; Galloway & Porath, 1997; Garland & Zigler, 1999; Kitano, 1990; Luftig & Nichols, 1990; Merrell & Gill, 1994; Nail & Evans, 1997; Neihart, 1999; Sayler & Brookshire, 1993). According to Neihart (1999), the results of the studies carried out in the second half of the twentieth century present two contradicting thoughts. The first of these is that gifted students are more adaptive than their peers whereas the second one shows that gifted children have a higher chance of experiencing inadaptability (Neihart, 1999; Peterson, 2009).

Recent studies have presented slightly stronger data regarding the comparison of gifted students and non-gifted children (Francis, Hawes, & Abbott, 2016; Jen, Wu, & Gentry, 2016; Peterson, 2009). The number of studies which argue that gifted individuals have stronger social and emotional characteristics than their peers, or that they are similar is quite high (Bracken & Brown, 2006; Cornell, Delcourt, Bland, Goldberg, & Oram, 1995; Chan, 2006; Eklund, Tanner, Stoll, & Anway, 2015; França-Freitas, Del Prette, & Del Prette, 2014; Francis et al., 2016; Garland & Zigler, 1999; Kroesbergen, van Hooijdonk, Van Viersen, Middel-Lalleman, & Reijnders, 2016; Merrell & Gill, 1994; Nail & Evans, 1997; França-Freitas et al., 2014; Robinson, 2008; van der Meulen et al., 2014; Vialle, Heaven, & Ciarrochi, 2007). Although the idea that being gifted is not a disadvantage socially or emotionally appears to be dominant when the literature is reviewed, there are also studies which prove the opposite is true (Coleman, & Cross, 1988; Jen, 2017). According to Peterson (2009) gifted individuals may experience difficulty making friends especially when they are younger, compared to other children, and they may be more introvert. Some researchers have argued that gifted students may be more vulnerable to social stress at school and personal stress, and experience more depression, anxiety and worry (Cross, Adams, Dixon & Holland, 2004; Delisle, 1990; Kitano, 1990; Ogurlu et al., 2018).

It may be assumed that the inconsistency in the findings of such studies may be due to the differences in content, method and sampling (Gagné & Gagnier, 2004). The content limitations of the studies may be a result of the fact that they focus on certain aspects of social and emotional development. When the literature is reviewed, it is observed that researchers have studied topics such as social coping (Chan, 2005; 2006; J. Cross, O'Reilly, Kim, Mammadov, & Cross, 2015; Bain & Bell, 2004; Foust, Rudasill, & Callahan, 2006; Rudasill, Foust & Callahan, 2007; Swiatek, 2002), social adjustment (Chan, 2002; 2003; 2006 Douthitt, 1992; Jeon, Lee, & Lee, 2003; Košir, Horvat, Aram, & Jurinec, 2016; Richards, Encel, & Shute, 2003; Sayler & Brookshire, 1993), social status (Luftig & Nichols, 1990), social competence (Lee, Olszewski-Kubilius, & Thomson, 2012; McCallister, Nash, & Meckstroth, 1996; Merrell & Gill, 1994), bullying (Neihart, 1999; Peters & Bain, 2011; Peterson, 2009), labelling (Cross, Coleman, & Terhaar-Yonkers, 2014). It is observed that studies focusing on problem behaviours are limited (Algozzine, Christian, Marr, & McClanahan, 2008; Bracken & Brown, 2006; Cornell et al., 1995; Delisle et al., 1987; Garland & Zigler, 1999; Richards et al., 2003; Sayler & Brookshire, 1993; Slifer, 1987). When the findings of the studies conducted to find out the problem behaviours of gifted students were studied, it was found out that gifted students did not display more problem behaviours than their peers. For instance, Cornell et al., (1995) made a comparison of the problem behaviours of 675 gifted students and 322 non-gifted students. They based their research on the thoughts of teachers and parents. No meaningful difference

was found between the two groups. Gallucci, Middleton and Kline (1999) evaluated the differences in behaviour and competence rates of 78 gifted students and 62 non-gifted students using the Child Behaviour Check List. No meaningful difference was found in the scale as a whole and its sub-dimensions. There have been studies in Turkey which revealed that gifted children display problem behaviours (Çetinkaya, Maya-Çalışkan, & Güngör, 2012; Çitil, 2016; İnci, 2014; Kurnaz, Tüybek, & Taşkesen, 2009; Sezer, 2015; Talas, Talas, & Sönmez, 2013; Yıldırım, 2012). There were findings in the studies carried out in Turkey showing that gifted students display problem behaviours causing disruptions in class.

It is observed that a majority of studies on the social skills, problem behaviours and academic success of gifted individuals have been carried out in Anglo-Saxon countries, mainly the USA (Cornell et al., 1995; Merrell & Gill, 1994; Neihart, 1999; Martin, Burns, & Schonlau, 2010; Stålnacke, & Smedler, 2011). It is observed that apart from the USA, studies focusing on the social, emotional and behavioral aspects of gifted children are quite limited (Farrent & Grant, 2005; Kroesbergen et al., 2016; Shechtman & Silektor, 2012; Stålnacke & Smedler, 2011; Vallerand, Gagné, Senécal, & Pelletier, 1994; van der Meulen et al., 2014; Zeidner & Shani-Zinovich, 2011). In this context, this study will contribute to literature as it was conducted in Turkey.

It is seen that the researchers in literature generally focus on one subject. According to Ben-Eliyahu et al., (2017), a majority of the literature studied academic and social skills individually and implied that they were independent of each other. Only a few researchers have studied social and academic motivation together. It is observed that research focusing on social skills, academic success and problem behaviours of gifted children as a whole is quite limited (Galloway & Porath, 1997; Shechtman & Silektor, 2012; Vialle et al., 2007). As for Turkey, there are studies on the social skills academic success and behavioral problems of groups which need different types of special education. There are studies on the social skills (Demir & Özdemir, 2016; Doğuş & Şafak, 2019; Özkubat & Özdemir, 2012; 2014) and problem behaviours of students with visual impairment (Demir & Özdemir, 2016) as well as studies on autism (Demir, 2014a; Demir, 2014b); mentally retarded students (Serin & Girli, 2012; Sucuoğlu & Özokçu, 2005); and students with hearing impairment (Poyraz-Tüy, 1999). Similarly, there are also studies which focus on the social skills of students with special needs in inclusive education (Sülün & Girli 2016). However, no studies have been found on the social skills, problem behaviours and academic competence of gifted students. When this limitation is taken into consideration, it is believed that this study which focuses on the social skills, problem behaviours and academic success of gifted and non-gifted Turkish students taught in the same environment will contribute to literature. In order to develop the social skills of students with special needs, it is necessary to find out the present social, behavioral and academic skills of students, and to prepare and implement appropriate educational programs. In this respect, the aim of this study is to compare the social skill levels, problem behaviours and academic behaviour of gifted students at elementary level with those of their peers, and to assess the social skill levels, problem behaviours levels and academic competence of gifted students and their non-gifted peers according to the variables age, gender and class.

For this purpose, answers were sought to the following questions:

1. Do the social skills of gifted students differ significantly from their non-gifted peers?
2. Do the problem behaviours of gifted students differ from their non-gifted peers?
3. Do the academic competencies levels of gifted students differ from their non-gifted peers?
4. Do the social skills, problem behaviours and academic competence of gifted students and those of their non-gifted peers differ significantly based on their age, gender, and grade?

METHOD

A descriptive method was used in this study to compare the social skills, problem behaviours and academic competence of gifted children and their non-gifted peers.

Participants

The study group consists of 50 gifted students and 50 non-gifted peers in second, third and fourth grade from public elementary schools located in Ankara in the 2017-2018 school year. There are two study groups classified as gifted students at elementary schools and their non-gifted peers. The distribution of the students in the study group according to number, gender, age and grade were also showed in Table 1.

Table 1. The Distribution of Students Participating in the Study

| Variable | Group | F | % |
|----------|--------|-----|-----|
| Groups | G | 50 | 50 |
| | NG | 50 | 50 |
| | Total | 100 | 100 |
| Age | 8 | 34 | 34 |
| | 9 | 32 | 32 |
| | 10 | 34 | 34 |
| | Total | 100 | 100 |
| Grade | 2 | 34 | 34 |
| | 3 | 30 | 30 |
| | 4 | 36 | 36 |
| | Total | 100 | 100 |
| Gender | Female | 50 | 50 |
| | Male | 50 | 50 |
| | Total | 100 | 100 |

*G=Gifted Students; NG=Non-Gifted Students

First of all, Guidance and Research Center of National Education Directorate in Ankara were visited for the purpose of selecting students for the study. Through collaboration with these research centres, students identified as gifted in formal educational assessment reports who did not display accompanying special needs were identified. As the second step, interviews were conducted with the school counsellors in order to determine the classrooms and the grades of the gifted students. As the third and final step, interviews were conducted with the class teachers of the gifted students to inform them on the purpose of the study and the data collection tools. During these interviews, gifted students and their non-gifted peers in the same classrooms were randomly chosen using class lists.

Data Collection Instruments and Procedure

Social skills can be assessed by using different methods such as direct observation, conducting structured interviews with people who know the student well- such as parents or peers, self-evaluation, sociometrics and rating scales (Merrell, 2001). There are behavioral rating scales which are used widely, and the validity and reliability of which have been proved by data collected from different groups. The most widely used rating scale is Social Skills Rating Scale (SSRS). Rating scales, which are used by having the parents and teachers rate the listed social skills, are widely used for assessing the social skills of students with special needs (Buhrow et al., 1998; Sucuoğlu & Özokçu, 2005), to implement social skills programs (Meimer, DiPerna and Oster, 2006; Miller, Lane and Wehby, 2005; Silver, Elder & DeBolt, 2005) and to assess the effectiveness of the programs used (Celeste, 2007; Lane, Givner & Pierson, 2004; Mathews, Fawcett, & Sheldon, 2009).

The Social Skills Rating Scale Teacher Form is an instrument which is developed by Gresham and Elliot (1990) in order to obtain data from teachers about their 6 to 11 aged students' social skills, problem behaviours and academic competence. Sucuoglu and Ozokcu (2005) translated The Social Skills Rating Scale form into Turkish and conducted reliability and validity analysis. Gresham and Elliot (1990) developed the Social Skills Rating Scale which includes three scales: Social Skills Scale (SSS), Problem Behaviours Scale (PBS), and Academic Competence Scale (ACS).

The Social Skills Scale (SSS) is the first of the SSRS and consists of 30 items. The scale has two different parts. The first of these have been developed to find out how often the student displays certain social skills whereas the second aims to find out how important these skills are for achieving success in the classroom. There are two sub-scales in Social Skills Scale. When the first part of the Social Skills Scale was to be filled in, the class teacher was asked to think about the behaviour displayed by the student in the one or two months and to decide on how often the student displayed each behaviour. The teachers were asked to circle zero (0) if the student never displayed a certain behaviour. If the student sometimes displayed the specific behaviour, they were asked to circle one (1). The teachers were asked to circle two (2) if the student displayed certain behaviour often. When the second part of the Social Skills Scale was to be filled in, the teachers were asked to rate the items from 1 to 30 to understand how important such behaviour was for success in the classroom. They were asked to circle zero (0) if a certain behaviour did not play a role on success in the classroom, to circle one (1) if the behaviour was important for success in the classroom, and to circle two (2) if the behaviour was of critical importance.

The Problem Behaviours Scale (PBS) was the second scale to be used and consisted of 18 items. Similar to the Social Skills Scale, the class teacher was asked to think about the behaviour displayed by the student in the last one or two months, and to decide on how often the student displayed the specified behaviour. They were asked to circle one (1) if the student sometimes displayed the behaviour. They were told to circle two (2) if the student displayed the behaviour often.

The Academic Competence Scale (ACS) was the last of the scales and consisted of 9 items. The teachers were told that they had to decide on the academic and learning behaviours of students that they observed in class using the 9 items defined in the scale. They were asked to rate each item 1 to 5, and to circle the number that best reflected their thoughts. The number 1 meant that the student displayed the lowest performance and was placed in the lowest 10% in the class whereas the number 5 meant that the student displayed the highest or most appropriate performance, and was placed in the highest 10% in the class. That they had to compare the rated student to other students in the classroom was also emphasized.

Data Analysis

The class teachers rated the social skills, problem behaviours and academic competence of the students in the study group using the SSRS. The data was analyzed using SPSS 22.00 software package. Descriptive statistics method was used for data analysis. Independent sample T-test was used to observe if there was a significant difference between the social skills, problem behaviours and academic competence scores of gifted students and their non-gifted peers. The Mann-Whitney U test was used to compare the social skills, problem behaviours and academic competence scores of the students according to gender whereas the Kruskal-Wallis H Test was used to compare the students' scores according to age and grade.

RESULTS

In the presentation of the analysis, the comparison of the social skills, problem behaviours and academic competence of gifted students and their peers, and the interpretation of these depending on gender, age, and grade are studied in separate headings.

The Comparison of the Social skills, Problem Behaviours and Academic Competence Differences Between Gifted and Non-gifted Students

The findings obtained by using the t-test to identify whether the social skills, problem behaviours and academic competence scores of gifted students and their non-gifted peers display a significant difference were shown in Table 2.

Table 2. t-Test results to compare the mean social skills problem behaviours and academic competence scores of gifted students and their non-gifted peers

| Scores | Groups | N | \bar{X} | ss | Sd | t | p |
|---------------------|--------|----|-----------|-------|----|------|-------|
| Social Skills | G | 50 | 44,58 | 11,25 | 98 | 2,60 | 0,01* |
| | NG | 50 | 38,06 | 13,67 | | | |
| Problem Behaviours | G | 50 | 12,08 | 6,85 | 98 | 0,66 | 0,50 |
| | NG | 50 | 11,02 | 8,88 | | | |
| Academic Competence | G | 50 | 40,86 | 5,45 | 98 | 5,23 | 0,00* |
| | NG | 50 | 31,24 | 11,79 | | | |

p<0,05

The results shown in Table 2 indicate that, there were a statistically meaningful difference between the social skills levels of gifted students and their non-gifted peers ($t=2,06$; $p<.005$). Similarly, it is observed that the academic competence scores of gifted students are statistically higher than those of their non-gifted peers ($t=5,23$; $p<.005$). As for problem behaviours, it is seen that there is no difference between gifted students and non-gifted students concerning problem behaviours ($t=0,66$; $p>.05$).

The Comparison of the Social Skills, Problem Behaviours and Academic Competence Scores of Gifted Students and Their Non-Gifted Peers according to the Variable Gender

The Mann –Whitney U test was used to find out if there was a difference in the social skills, problem behaviours and academic competence scores of gifted students and their non-gifted peers according to the variable gender, and the findings are presented in Table 3,

Table 3. The Results of the Mann Whitney-U Test Conducted to Find out Whether there was a Difference in Social Skills, Problem Behaviours and Academic Competence Scores of Gifted Students and Their Non-gifted Peers According to the Variable Gender

| Groups | Scores | Gender | N | AoR | RT | U | z | p |
|--------|---------------------|--------|----|-------|--------|--------|-------|-------|
| G | Social Skills | Female | 25 | 32,90 | 822,50 | 127,50 | -3,59 | 0,00* |
| | | Male | 25 | 18,10 | 452,50 | | | |
| | Problem Behaviour | Female | 25 | 21,12 | 528,00 | 203,00 | -2,12 | 0,33* |
| | | Male | 25 | 29,88 | 747,00 | | | |
| | Academic Competence | Female | 25 | 29,26 | 731,50 | 218,50 | -1,85 | 0,06 |
| | | Male | 25 | 21,74 | 543,50 | | | |
| NG | Social Skills | Female | 25 | 31,64 | 791,00 | 159,00 | -2,98 | 0,03* |
| | | Male | 25 | 19,36 | 484,00 | | | |
| | Problem Behaviours | Female | 25 | 21,24 | 531,00 | 206,00 | -2,07 | 0,03* |
| | | Male | 25 | 29,76 | 744,00 | | | |
| | Academic Competence | Female | 25 | 31,22 | 780,50 | 169,50 | -2,76 | 0,00* |
| | | Male | 25 | 19,78 | 494,50 | | | |

p<0,05

As can be seen in Table 3, there is a statistically significant difference in the social skills ($z=-3,59$; $p<.05$) and problem behaviours ($z=-2,12$; $p<.05$) of gifted children according to the variable gender. In this respect, it was found out that female students had better social skills whereas males students displayed more problem behaviours. No statistically significant difference was found in gifted students concerning academic competence depending on gender. ($z=-1,85$; $p>.05$).

On the other hand, significant differences were found among non-gifted students concerning social skills ($z=-2,98$; $p<.05$), problem behaviours ($z=-2,07$; $p<.05$) and academic competence levels ($z=-2,76$; $p<.05$) depending on gender. Thus, as can also be observed in the means of social skills scores, it was found out that female students performed better social skills and academic competence compared to male students, which presented statistically significant differences. It was also found out that male students displayed more problem behaviours.

The Comparison of the Social Skills, Problem Behaviours and Academic Competence of Gifted Children and Their Non-gifted Peers According to the Variable Age

The Kruskal-Wallis H Test was performed to find out whether age affected the mean scores of social skills, problem behaviours and academic competence. The results are presented in Table 4. It is observed in the table that the social skills ($\chi^2=4,28$; $p>.05$) and academic competence of gifted students do not change according to age ($\chi^2=3,89$; $p>.05$). It is also observed that the social skills ($\chi^2=5,01$; $p>.05$) and problem behaviours of non-gifted students do not change according to age ($\chi^2=1,24$; $p>.05$).

Table 4. The Results of the Kruskal- Wallis H Test Performed to Identify Whether the Social Skills, Problem Behaviours and Academic Competence Scores of Gifted Students and Non-gifted Students Presented a Difference Depending on Age

| Groups | Scores | Age | N | AoR | Sd | X^2 | p | Post Hoc |
|--------|---------------------|-----|----|-------|----|-------|-------|----------|
| G | Social Skills | 8 | 13 | 28,15 | 2 | 4,28 | 0,11 | --- |
| | | 9 | 14 | 30,46 | | | | |
| | | 10 | 23 | 20,98 | | | | |
| | Problem Behaviours | 8 | 13 | 22,65 | 2 | 9,43 | 0,00* | 9<10 |
| | | 9 | 14 | 17,43 | | | | |
| | | 10 | 23 | 32,02 | | | | |
| | Academic Competence | 8 | 13 | 26,96 | 2 | 3,89 | 0,14 | --- |
| | | 9 | 14 | 30,82 | | | | |
| | | 10 | 23 | 21,43 | | | | |
| NG | Social Skills | 8 | 21 | 21,21 | 2 | 5,01 | 0,08 | --- |
| | | 9 | 18 | 25,72 | | | | |
| | | 10 | 11 | 33,32 | | | | |
| | Problem Behaviours | 8 | 21 | 22,90 | 2 | 1,24 | 0,53 | --- |
| | | 9 | 18 | 28,03 | | | | |
| | | 10 | 11 | 26,32 | | | | |
| | Academic Competence | 8 | 21 | 21,88 | 2 | 4,61 | 0,01* | 8<10 |
| | | 9 | 18 | 24,89 | | | | |
| | | 10 | 11 | 33,41 | | | | |

$p<0,05$

Table 4 is studied, it is observed that there is a significant difference between 10-year olds and 9-year olds concerning problem behaviours. It was found out that 10-year olds displayed more problem behaviours compared to their 9-year old peers. ($\chi^2=9,45$; $p<.05$). Similarly, it was found out that there was a significant difference in 8-year old and 10-year old non-gifted children in academic competence, and in this context the academic competence of 10-year old students was higher than that of 8-year old students ($\chi^2=4,61$; $p<.05$).

The Comparison of The Social Skills, Problem Behaviours and Academic Competence of Gifted Children and Their Non-gifted Peers in Relation to Grade

The Kruskal-Wallis H Test was used to find out the differences in social skills, problem behaviours and academic competence scores of gifted and non-gifted students according to grade, and the findings are presented in Table 5.

Table 5. The Results of the Kruskal Wallis-H Test Conducted to Find Out Whether There Were Differences in the Social Skills, Problem Behaviours and Academic Competence Scores of Gifted and Non-gifted Students in Relation to Grade

| Groups | Scores | Grade | N | AoR | Sd | χ^2 | p | Post Hoc |
|--------|---------------------|-------|----|-------|----|----------|-------|----------|
| G | Social Skills | 2 | 13 | 28,15 | 2 | 4,36 | 0,11 | --- |
| | | 3 | 13 | 30,88 | | | | |
| | | 4 | 24 | 21,15 | | | | |
| | Problem Behaviours | 2 | 13 | 22,65 | 2 | 8,54 | 0,01* | 3<4 |
| | | 3 | 13 | 17,38 | | | | |
| | | 4 | 24 | 31,44 | | | | |
| | Academic Competence | 2 | 13 | 26,96 | 2 | 5,88 | 0,05 | --- |
| | | 3 | 13 | 32,65 | | | | |
| | | 4 | 24 | 20,83 | | | | |
| NG | Social Skills | 2 | 21 | 21,21 | 2 | 5,82 | 0,05 | --- |
| | | 3 | 17 | 24,88 | | | | |
| | | 4 | 12 | 33,88 | | | | |
| | Problem Behaviours | 2 | 21 | 22,90 | 2 | 1,31 | 0,51 | --- |
| | | 3 | 17 | 28,29 | | | | |
| | | 4 | 12 | 26,08 | | | | |
| | Academic Competence | 2 | 21 | 21,88 | 2 | 6,11 | 0,04* | 2<4 |
| | | 3 | 17 | 23,68 | | | | |
| | | 4 | 12 | 34,42 | | | | |

* $p < .05$

According to Table 5 the social skills ($\chi^2=4,36$; $p > .05$) and academic competence ($\chi^2=5,88$; $p > .05$) of gifted students were not found to be significant in relation to grade. However, it was found out that fourth grade students displayed more problem behaviours in comparison to peers in third grade ($\chi^2=8,54$; $p < .05$). It was also found out that there was no difference in the social skills ($\chi^2=5,82$; $p > .05$) and problem behaviours ($\chi^2=1,31$; $p > .05$) of non-gifted students in relation to grade. However, it was found out that fourth grade students had better academic competence compared to peers in second grade ($\chi^2=6,11$; $p < .05$).

DISCUSSIONS

According to the results of the study, it was found out that the social skills levels of gifted students were statistically significantly more advanced than those of their non-gifted peers. These findings are consistent with studies which state that gifted individuals have similar or better social and emotional traits when compared to their peers (Bracken & Brown, 2006; Cornell et al., 1995; Chan, 2006; Eklund et al., 2015; França-Freitas et al., 2014; Francis et al., 2016; Garland & Zigler, 1999; Kroesbergen et al., 2016; Merrell & Gill, 1994; Nail & Evans, 1997; França-Freitas et al., 2014; Robinson, 2008; van der Meulen et al., 2014; Vialle et al., 2007). Some experts in the field have argued in their research that gifted individuals are more vulnerable socially and emotionally (Farrent & Grant, 2005; Francis et al., 2016; Lee et al., 2012; Peterson, 2009; Robinson, 2002). Vialle et al., (2007) have argued that although most of the gifted group displayed high academic performance, social and emotional data has shown that some gifted individuals are under risk. In this respect, the findings of our study are not consistent with these limited studies.

The findings of this study indicate that the academic competence of gifted students is statistically more advanced than the academic competence of their non-gifted peers. These findings are consistent with literature (Gubbels, Segers, & Verhoeven, 2018; Gottfried et al., 1994; Košir et al., 2016; Kroesbergen et al., 2016; Litster & Roberts, 2011; Masden, Leung, Shore, Schneider, & Stephen, 2015; Neihart, 1999; Sak, 2012; Subotnik et al., 2011; Vialle et al., 2007; Wai et al., 2005). Vialle et al., (2007) have stated that gifted students have much higher academic competence when compared to their non-gifted peers (Subotnik et al., 2011). In addition, it is assumed that gifted individuals have judgement skills that enable them to succeed in different areas and that they remain gifted throughout their lives even if they do not really achieve success. It was also observed in the meta-analysis conducted by Litster and Roberts (2011) that gifted children had higher scores in academic competence.

According to the findings of the study, it is observed that there is no difference in problem behaviours between gifted students and their non-gifted peers. (Cornell et al., 1995; Francis et al., 2016; Galloway & Porath, 1997; Gallucci et al., 1999; Garland & Zigler, 1999; Litster & Roberts, 2011). For instance, Francis et al., (2016) have shown in their study that gifted children display outstanding social emotional adjustment and less behavioral difficulty than their typically non-gifted peers. Gallucci et al., (1999) have assessed the behaviour scores in Child Behaviour Control List, and differences in competence rates of 78 gifted students and 62 non-gifted students. No significant difference was found between the two groups in the whole of the scale and its sub-dimensions. Although the findings of this study are consistent with international literature, they contradict the findings of studies conducted in Turkey (Çetinkaya et al., 2012; Çitil, 2016; İnci, 2014; Kurnaz, 2009; Sezer, 2015; Talas et al., 2013; Yıldırım, 2012). The reason for this contradiction may be due to the limited number of studies in Turkey. For this reason, further research should be carried out in Turkey on social- emotional aspects of gifted individuals.

In this study, no statistically significant difference was found in the academic competence of gifted students in relation to gender. These findings are also consistent with literature (Ogurlu et al., 2018; Vallerand et al., 1994; Subotnik et al., 2011). It was found out that female students have better social skills, and that male students display problem behaviours more often. There is no agreement in literature on the effect of gender on social skills and problem behaviours (Aydın & Konyalıoğlu, 2011; Cross et al., 2008; Lee et al., 2012; Ogurlu et al., 2018; Peters & Bain, 2011; Swiatek, 2002; Ural & Kanlıkılıçer, 2010). Some studies in literature have reached the conclusion that female students have higher social skills compared to male students (Bacal, 2015; Masden et al., 2015; Gagné & Gagnier, 2004). For instance, Ural and Kanlıkılıçer (2010) concluded in their study that males display more problem behaviours in comparison to females. In another study, Algozzine et al., (2008) stated that male students are sent to the discipline office three times as much as female students. Some research states that male students have higher social skills than female students (Amini, 2005; Luftig & Nichols, 1991; Yıldırım, 2012) whereas some researchers have found no differences (Howard-Hamilton, & Franks, 1995; Foust et al., 2006; Vallerand et al., 1994).

In this study, it was found out that 10-year old students display more problem behaviours compared to their 9-year old peers. It was also found out that there was a significant difference in the academic competence of 10-year old and 8-year old students who had similar development. Thus, it was found out that 10-year old students had higher academic competence than their 8-year old peers. There is limited data in literature on this topic (Francis et al., 2016; Martin et al., 2010; Neihart, 1999). For instance, according to Richards et al., (2003) gifted adolescents in upper classes display less problem behaviours in comparison to their non-gifted peers. Gagné and Gagnier (2004) have stated that there is no difference in behaviour, social integration, academic maturity and academic success between gifted students and their non-gifted peers in terms of grade and age. Similarly, Vallerand et al., (1994) have reported no difference in social skills in different grades. Cornell et al., (1995) compared 675 gifted students and 322 non-gifted students in second and third grade in their study, and reported no significant difference in problem behaviours in relation to grade and age. Likewise, Shechtman, & Silektor, (2012) compared the social- emotional difficulties of 974 students in fifth and twelfth grade. They have not reported any differences in relation to grade and age.

In this study, the social skills and academic competence of gifted students were not found to be meaningful in relation to grade. However, it was found out that fourth grade students displayed more problem behaviours in comparison to their third grade peers. It was also found out that there was no difference in the social skills and problem behaviours of non-gifted students in relation to grade. However, it was found out that fourth grade students had higher academic competence in comparison to their second grade peers. There is limited data in literature on the social skills and problem behaviours of students in relation to grade and age (Çitil & Ataman, 2019; Francis et al., 2016; França-Freitas et al., 2014; Ogurlu et al., 2018; Martin et al., 2010). This is so because studies on this topic focus mainly on the comparison of two groups of gifted individuals and non-gifted individuals. According to the limited number of research, when age and grade increase, there is an increase in social skills and a decrease in problem behaviours. For instance, in a study conducted in an elementary school for gifted children, Çitil (2016) found out that problem behaviours was more common among

first grade students. According to Robinson (2002), gifted individuals may have difficulty making friends especially when they are younger and when their environment is limited to classroom, school, neighbourhood or a small town. It may be true that students have more stable relationships as they get older. For instance, according to Swiatek (2002) comparisons on grade revealed that older students focus on popularity more than younger students.

In conclusion, research on gifted individuals focuses more on cognitive variables and less on the social and emotional needs of students (Foley-Nicpon et al., 2017; Mueller, 2009; Sisk, 2005; van der Meulen et al., 2014; Zeidner, & Shani-Zinovich, 2011). Research results on the social emotional aspects of gifted individuals are inconsistent (Bain & Bell, 2004; Peterson, 2009 van der Meulen et al., 2014). It may be said that the findings of this study contribute to studies on this subject. Different from many studies in literature, social skills, problem behaviours and academic competence were studied together in this study, and comparisons were made between two groups. However, the greatest limitation of this study was the small sample size. It will be useful to conduct this study again with a bigger sample group in order to achieve stronger results.

This study tried to find out the social skills, behaviour and academic competence of gifted students and non-gifted students with data received from teachers. To present the situation on this topic, gathering simultaneous data from families, students and peers as well as teachers, and making appropriate comparisons will present stronger results. As França-Freitas et al., (2014) have also recommended, it will be beneficial to conduct similar studies using different data collection tools and procedures such as sociometric assessment. Although the results of this study show that gifted children have higher social skills and academic competence in comparison to their peers, it is necessary to carry out further research to clarify this situation. It should also be kept in mind that gifted individuals are more sensitive in some aspects and academically more advanced than their peers. These factors should be taken into consideration in the classroom and the school environment, and effective measures should be taken for students with adjustment problems. The key issue in the field of gifted individuals is identifying individuals who will be able to solve the serious problems the world is dealing with (Glăveanu & Kaufman, 2017). According to Sternberg (2017), thinking on one's own as an individual can never solve the difficulties of the present and the future in the present century. For this reason, social skills are the main factor through which intelligence and giftedness can be of benefit to the individual, the society and the world. Social skills may be one of the biggest problems and the solutions of the present century.

REFERENCES

- Algozzine, K., Christian, C., Marr, M. B., McClanahan, T., & White, R. (2008). Demography of problem behavior in elementary schools. *Exceptionality, 16*(2), 93-104. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09362830801981369>
- Amini, M. (2005). Identifying stressors and reactions to stressors in gifted and non-gifted students. *International Education Journal, 6*, 136-140.
- Aydın, O., & Konyalıoğlu, P. (2011). 18-21 yaş grubu bireylerin genel zekâ düzeyleri ile psikolojik semptom düzeyleri arasındaki ilişki [The relation between general intelligence levels and psychological symptom levels of adolescents]. *Türk Üstün Zekâ ve Eğitim Dergisi, 1*, 77-103.
- Bacal, E. (2015). The relationship between placement and social skills in gifted students. (Unpublished doctoral dissertation) Arizona State University, USA. Retrieved from <https://pdfs.semanticscholar.org/d7fa/1a2baed459a5e133701803775a0d5343565f.pdf>
- Bain, S. K., & Bell, S. M. (2004). Social self-concept, social attributions, and peer relationships in fourth, fifth, and sixth graders who are gifted compared to high achievers. *Gifted Child Quarterly, 48*(3), 167-178. <https://doi.org/10.1177/001698620404800302>

- Bracken, B. A., & Brown, E. F. (2006). Behavioral identification and assessment of gifted and talented students. *Journal of Psychoeducational Assessment*, 24(2), 112-122. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0734282905285246>
- Buhrow, M. M., Hartshorne, T., S., & Bradley-Johnson, S. (1998). Parents and teachers ratings of the social skills of elementary-age students who are blind. *Journal of Visual Impairment and Blindness*, 92(7), 213– 227. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0145482X9809200710>
- Celeste, M. (2007). Social skills intervention for a child who is blind. *Journal of Visual Impairment and Blindness*, 101(9), 521-533. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0145482X0710100902>
- Chan, D. W. (2002). Giftedness, adjustment problems, and psychological distress among Chinese secondary students in Hong Kong. *Journal for the Education of the Gifted*, 26(1), 6-24. <https://doi.org/10.1177/016235320202600102>
- Chan, D. W. (2003). Assessing adjustment problems of gifted students in Hong Kong: The development of the The development of the student adjustment problems inventory. *Gifted Child Quarterly*, 47(2), 107-117. <https://doi.org/10.1177/001698620304700202>
- Chan, D. W. (2005). The structure of social coping among Chinese gifted children and youths in Hong Kong. *Journal for the Education of the Gifted*, 29(1), 8-29. <https://doi.org/10.1177/016235320502900102>
- Childs, R. E. (1981). A comparison of the adaptive behavior of normal and gifted five and six year old children. *Roeper Review*, 4 (2), 41-43. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02783198109552589>
- Cornell, D. G., Delcourt, M. A. B., Bland, L. C., Goldberg, M. D., & Oram, G. (1995). Low incidence of behavior problems among elementary school students in gifted programs. *Talents and Gifts*, 18(1), 4–19. <https://doi.org/10.1177/016235329401800102>
- Cross, T. L., & Cross, J. R. (2017). Maximizing potential: A school-based conception of psychosocial development. *High Ability Studies*, 28(1), 43-58. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13598139.2017.1292896>
- Cross, T. L., Cassady, J. C., Dixon, F. A., & Adams, C. M. (2008). The psychology of gifted adolescents as measured by the MMPI-A. *Gifted Child Quarterly*, 52(4), 326-339. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0016986208321810>
- Cross, T. L., Adams, C., Dixon, F., & Holland, J. (2004). Psychological characteristics of academically gifted adolescents attending a residential academy: A longitudinal study. *Journal for the Education of the Gifted*, 28(2), 159-181. <https://doi.org/10.1177/016235320402800203>
- Cross, T. L., Coleman, L. J., & Terhaar-Yonkers, M. (2014). The social cognition of gifted adolescents in schools: Managing the stigma of giftedness. *Journal for the Education of the Gifted*, 37(1), 30-39. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0162353214521492>
- Cross, J. R., O'Reilly, C., Kim, M., Mammadov, S., & Cross, T. L. (2015). Social coping and self-concept among young gifted students in Ireland and the United States: A cross-cultural study. *High Ability Studies*, 26(1), 39-61. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13598139.2015.1031881>
- Çetinkaya, Ç., Maya-Çalışkan, İ., & Güngör, H. (2012). Üstün yetenekli öğrencilerin liderlik özelliklerinden kaynaklanan sınıf yönetimi sorunları. [Classroom management problems derives from gifted and talented students' leadership qualities.]. *Sakarya Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 2(24), 7-29.

- Çitil, M., & Ataman, A. (2019). Positive behavior support-based preventive classroom management practices for gifted students: An action research. *Turkish Journal of Giftedness and Education*, 9(2), 102-130.
- Çitil, M. (2016). *Üstün yetenekli öğrencilere sunulan olumlu davranışsal destek temelli problem davranışları önleyici sınıf yönetimi uygulamaları: Eylem araştırması* [Positive behaviour support based preventive classroom management practices for gifted students: An action research.]. (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Gazi Üniversitesi Eğitim Bilimleri Enstitüsü, Ankara, Türkiye.
- Delisle, J. R., Whitmore, J. R., & Ambrose, R. P. (1987). Preventing discipline problems with gifted students. *Teaching Exceptional Children*, 19(4), 32- 38.
- Delisle, J. R. (1990). The gifted adolescent at risk: Strategies and resources for suicide prevention among gifted youth. *Journal for the Education of the Gifted*, 13(3), 212-228.
- Demir, F. E., & Ozdemir, S. (2016). A comparison of social skills of students with visual impairments and typically developing students. *International E-Journal of Advances in Education*, 2(4), 85-94.
- Demir, Ş. (2014). Assessing social skills of children with autism. *Journal of Faculty of Educational Sciences*, 47(2), 223-244.
- Doğuş, M., & Şafak, P. (2019) Görme yetersizliği olan öğrencilerin benlik saygısı ve sosyal becerileri arasındaki ilişkinin incelenmesi, [An investigation of relationship between the self-esteem and social skills in students with visual impairments]. *Cumhuriyet Uluslararası Eğitim Dergisi*, 8(4), 1026-1047.
- Douthitt, V. L. (1992) A comparison of adaptive behavior in gifted and nongifted children, *Roeper Review*, 14:3, 149-151, DOI: 10.1080/02783199209553410
- Eklund, K., Tanner, N., Stoll, K., & Anway, L. (2015). Identifying emotional and behavioral risk among gifted and nongifted children: A multi-gate, multi-informant approach. *School Psychology Quarterly*, 30, 197–211. <https://doi.org/10.1037/spq0000080>
- Ben-Eliyahu, A., Linnenbrink-Garcia, L., & Putallaz, M. (2017). The intertwined nature of adolescents' social and academic lives: Social and academic goal orientations. *Journal of Advanced Academics*, 28(1), 66–93. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1932202X16685307>
- Farrent, S., & Grant, A. (2005). Some Australian findings about the socio-emotional development of gifted pre-schoolers. *Gifted Education International*, 19(2), 142-153. <https://doi.org/10.1177/026142940501900208>
- Foley-Nicpon, Susan G. Assouline, D. Martin Kivlighan, Staci Fosenburg, Charles Cederberg & Michelle Nanji (2017). The effects of a social and talent development intervention for high ability youth with social skill difficulties, *High Ability Studies*, 28:1,73-92, DOI: 10.1080/13598139.2017.1298997
- Foust, R. C., Rudasill, K. M., & Callahan, C. M. (2006). An investigation into the gender and age differences in the social coping of academically advanced students. *Journal of Advanced Academics*, 18(1), 60-80. <https://doi.org/10.4219/jaa-2006-346>
- Francis, R., Hawes, D. J., & Abbott, M. (2016). Intellectual giftedness and psychopathology in children and adolescents: A systematic literature review. *Exceptional Children*, 82(3), 279-302. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0014402915598779>

- França-Freitas, M. L. P. D., Del Prette, A., & Del Prette, Z. A. P. (2014). Social skills of gifted and talented children. *Estudos de Psicologia* 19(4), 288-295. <https://doi.org/10.1590/S1413-294X2014000400006>
- Gagné, F., & Gagnier, N. (2004). The socio-affective and academic impact of early entrance to school. *Roepers Review*, 26(3), 128-138. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02783190409554258>
- Galloway, B., & Porath, M. (1997). Parent and teacher views of gifted children's social abilities. *Roepers Review*, 20(2), 118-121. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02783199709553872>
- Gallucci, N. T., Middleton, G., & Kline, A. (1999). Intellectually superior children and behavioral problems and competence. *Roepers Review*, 22(1), 18-21. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02783199909553992>
- Garland, A. F., & Zigler, E. (1999). Emotional and behavioral problems among highly intellectually gifted youth. *Roepers Review*, 22(1), 41-44. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02783199909553996>
- Glăveanu, V. P., & Kaufman, J. C. (2017). Socializing giftedness: Toward an ACCEL-S approach. *Roepers Review*, 39(4), 226-229. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02783193.2017.1362682>
- Gottfried, A. W., Gottfried, A. E., Bathurst, K., & Guerin, D. W. (1994). *Gifted IQ: Early developmental aspects: The Fullerton longitudinal study*. New York, NY: Plenum.
- Gresham, F. M., & Elliot, S. N. (1990). *Social Skills Rating System*. Circle Pines: American Guidance Services.
- Gubbels, J., Segers, E., & Verhoeven, L. (2018). How children's intellectual profiles relate to their cognitive, socio-emotional, and academic functioning. *High Ability Studies*, 29(2), 149-168. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13598139.2018.1507902>
- Howard-Hamilton, M., & Franks, B. A. (1995). Gifted adolescents: Psychological behaviors, values, and developmental implications. *Roepers Review*, 17(3), 186-191.
- İnci, G. (2014). Üstün yetenekli öğrencilerin sınıf içi davranış sorunlarının belirlenmesi ve çözüm önerileri [Identification of gifted and talented students' behavior problems in the classroom and solutions]. (Unpublished master's thesis). Sakarya Üniversitesi Eğitim Bilimleri Enstitüsü, Sakarya, Türkiye.
- Jen, E., Wu, J., & Gentry, M. (2016). Social and affective concerns high-ability adolescents indicate they would like to discuss with a caring adult: Implications for educators. *Journal of Advanced Academics*, 27(1), 39-59. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1932202X15621904>
- Jeon, K. W., Lee, S. D., & Lee, K. H. (2003). A Qualitative research on early entrance to the first grade: Social, emotional, and academic maladjustment. *Gifted Education International*, 17(3), 280-286. <https://doi.org/10.1177/026142940301700310>
- Kitano, M. K. (1990). Intellectual abilities and psychological intensities in young children: Implications for the gifted. *Roepers Review*, 13(1), 5-10. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02783199009553296>
- Košir, K., Horvat, M., Aram, U., & Jurinec, N. (2016). Is being gifted always an advantage? Peer relations and self-concept of gifted students. *High Ability Studies*, 27(2), 129-148. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13598139.2015.1108186>
- Kroesbergen, E. H., Van Hooijdonk, M., Van Viersen, S., Middel-Lalleman, M. M. N., & Reijnders, J. J. W. (2016). The psychological well-being of early identified gifted children. *Gifted Child Quarterly*, 60(1), 16-30. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0016986215609113>

- Kurnaz, A., Tüybek, C. & Taşkesen, Ü. S. (2009, Mart). *Sınıf öğretmenlerinin üstün yetenekli öğrencilere ilişkin görüş ve uygulamaları*. II. Üstün Yetenekli Çocuklar Ulusal Kongresinde sunulan bildiri, Anadolu Üniversitesi, Eskişehir, Türkiye.
- Lane, K. L., Givner, C. C., & Pierson, M. R. (2004). Teacher expectations of student behavior: Social skills necessary for success in elementary school classrooms. *The Journal of Special Education, 38*(2), 104-110.
- Lee, S. Y., Olszewski-Kubilius, P., & Thomson, D. T. (2012). Academically gifted students' perceived interpersonal competence and peer relationships. *Gifted Child Quarterly, 56*(2), 90-104. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0016986212442568>
- Litster, K., & Roberts, J. (2011). The self-concepts and perceived competencies of gifted and non-gifted students: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Research in Special Educational Needs, 11*, 130–140. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1471-3802.2010.01166.x>
- Luftig, R. L., & Nichols, M. L. (1990). Assessing the social status of gifted students by their age peers. *Gifted Child Quarterly, 34*(3), 111–115. <https://doi.org/10.1177/001698629003400305>
- 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, *Roepers Review, 13*:3, 148-153, <https://doi.org/10.1080/02783199109553341>
- Martin, L. T., Burns, R. M., & Schonlau, M. (2010). Mental disorders among gifted and nongifted youth: A selected review of the epidemiologic literature. *Gifted Child Quarterly, 54*(1), 31-41. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0016986209352684>
- Masden, C. A., Leung, O. N., Shore, B. M., Schneider, B. H., & Udvari, S. J. (2015). Social-perspective coordination and gifted adolescents' friendship quality. *High Ability Studies, 26*(1), 3-38. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13598139.2015.1028613>
- Mathews, T. L., Fawcett, S. B., & Sheldon, J. B. (2009). Effects of a peer engagement program on socially withdrawn children with a history of maltreatment. *Child and Behavior Therapy, 31*(4), 270-291. <https://doi.org/10.1080/07317100903333160>
- McCallister, C., Nash, W. R., & Meckstroth, E. (1996). The social competence of gifted children: Experiments and experience. *Roepers Review, 18*(4), 273-276. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02783199609553758>
- Meier, C. R., DiPerna, J. C., & Oster, M. M. (2006). Importance of social skills in the elementary grades. *Education and Treatment of Children, 29*(3), 409-419.
- Merrell, K. W. & Gill, S. J. (1994) Using teacher ratings of social behavior to differentiate gifted from non-gifted students, *Roepers Review, 16* (4), 286-289. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02783199409553600>
- Miller, M. J., Lane, K. L., & Wehby, J. (2005). Social skills instruction for students with high-incidence disabilities: a school-based intervention to address acquisition deficits. *Preventing School Failure, 49*(2), 27–39.
- Silver, C. H., Elder, W., & DeBolt, A. J. (1999). Social skills self-appraised of children with specific arithmetic disabilities. *Developmental Neuropsychology, 16*(1), 117–127. <https://doi.org/10.1207/S15326942DN160107>
- Mueller, C. E. (2009). Protective factors as barriers to depression in gifted and nongifted adolescents. *Gifted Child Quarterly, 53*, 3–14. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0016986208326552>

- Neihart, M. (1999). The impact of giftedness on psychological well-being: What does the empirical literature say? *Roeper review*, 22(1), 10-17. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02783199909553991>
- Nail, J. M., & Evans, J. G. (1997). The emotional adjustment of gifted adolescents: A view of global functioning. *Roeper Review*, 20(1), 18-21. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02783199709553845>
- Ogurlu, U., Yalın, H. S., & Yavuz Birben, F. (2018). The relationship between psychological symptoms, creativity, and loneliness in gifted children. *Journal for the Education of the Gifted*, 41(2), 193-210. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0162353218763968>
- Özkubat, U., & Özdemir, S. (2012). Görme yetersizliğinden etkilenmiş ve normal gelişim gösteren çocukların sosyal becerilerinin karşılaştırılması. *Ankara Üniversitesi Eğitim Bilimleri Fakültesi Özel Eğitim Dergisi*, 13(1), 1-14.
- Özkubat, U., & Özdemir, S. (2014). A comparison of social skills in Turkish children with visual impairments, children with intellectual impairments and typically developing children, *International Journal of Inclusive Education*, 18(5), 500-514.
- Peters, M. P., & Bain, S. K. (2011). Bullying and victimization rates among gifted and high-achieving students. *Journal for the Education of the Gifted*, 34(4), 624-643. <https://doi.org/10.1177/016235321103400405>
- Peterson, J. S. (2009). Myth 17: Gifted and talented individuals do not have unique social and emotional needs. *Gifted Child Quarterly*, 53(4), 280-282. <https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/pdf/10.1177/0016986209346946>
- Poyraz Tüy, S. (1999). 3-6 yaş arasındaki işitme engelli ve işiten çocukların sosyal beceri ve problem davranışları yönünden karşılaştırılmaları, [Being compared with point of the social skill and problem behaviors of hearing impaired and hearing children whose ages are between 3-6]. (Unpublished master's thesis), *Ankara Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Ankara, Türkiye*.
- Richards, J., Encel, J., & Shute, R. (2003). The emotional and behavioural adjustment of intellectually gifted adolescents: A multi-dimensional, multi-informant approach. *High Ability Studies*, 14(2), 153-164. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1359813032000163889>
- Robinson, N. M. (2002). Individual differences in gifted students' attributions for academic performance. In M. Neihart, S. M. Reis, N.M. Robinson, & S.M. Moon (Eds.), *The social and emotional development of gifted children: What do we know?* (pp. 61-69). Waco, TX: Prufrock Press.
- Robinson, N. M. (2008). The social world of gifted children and youth. In *Handbook of giftedness in children* (pp. 33-51). Springer, Boston, MA.
- Rudasill, K. M., Foust, R. C., & Callahan, C. M. (2007). The social coping questionnaire: An examination of its structure with an American sample of gifted adolescents. *Journal for the Education of the Gifted*, 30(3), 353-371. <https://doi.org/10.1177/016235320703000304>
- Sak, U. (2012). Üstün zekalılar: Özellikleri tanılanmaları eğitimleri. [The gifted: Their characteristics, identification, education]. (2nd ed.). Ankara: Vize yayıncılık.
- Sayler, M. F., & 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. <https://doi.org/10.1177/001698629303700403>
- Serin, G. E. Ç., & Girli, A. (2012). Zihinsel engelli ergenlerin sosyal beceri düzeyleri ve davranış problemleri ile ebeveynlerinin genel öz yeterlilik algı düzeylerinin karşılaştırılarak

incelenmesi, [Social skill and behavior problems levels in adolescent with mental disabilities by comparing parent' general investigation of self-efficacy]. *Dokuz Eylül Üniversitesi Buca Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 34, 69-78.

- Sezer, Ş. (2015). Üstün yeteneklilerin sınıf içinde olumsuz davranışları ve yönetilmesine ilişkin öğretmen görüşleri. [Teacher opinion related to disruptive behaviors of gifted students in classroom and managing them]. *Uluslararası Türk Eğitim Bilimleri Dergisi*, 3(4), 317-333.
- Shechtman, Z., & Silektor, A. (2012). Social competencies and difficulties of gifted children compared to nongifted peers. *Roeper Review*, 34(1), 63-72. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02783193.2012.627555>
- Sisk, D. (2005). Psychosocial development of the gifted: Implications for a counseling intervention for gifted students. *Gifted Education International*, 19(3), 213-225. <https://doi.org/10.1177/026142940501900304>
- Slifer, K. J. (1987). *The application of classroom management strategies to the behavior of intellectually gifted students attending exceptional education classes* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Florida State University, College of Arts and Science, Florida, USA.
- Stålnacke, J., & Smedler, A. C. (2011). Psychosocial experiences and adjustment among adult Swedes with superior general mental ability. *Journal for the Education of the Gifted*, 34(6), 900-918. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0162353211424988>
- Sternberg, R. J. (2017). ACCEL: A new model for identifying the gifted. *Roeper Review*, 39, 152-169. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02783193.2017.1318658>
- Subotnik, R. F., Olszewski-Kubilius, P., & Worrell, F. C. (2011). Rethinking giftedness and gifted education: A proposed direction forward based on psychological science. *Psychological Science In The Public Interest*, 12(1), 3-54. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1529100611418056>
- Sucuoğlu, B., & Özokçu, O. (2005). Kaynaştırma öğrencilerinin sosyal becerilerinin değerlendirilmesi [Assessment of social skills of inclusive students]. *Ankara Üniversitesi Eğitim Bilimleri Fakültesi Özel Eğitim Dergisi*, 6(1), 41-65.
- Sülün, K., & Girli, A. (2016). İlköğretim genel eğitim sınıfı ile özel eğitim sınıfında öğrenim gören kaynaştırma öğrencilerinin sosyal becerilerinin incelenmesi, [A comparative analysis on the social competences of mainstreaming students in general education class and special education class]. *Batı Anadolu Eğitim Bilimleri Dergisi*, 7(13), 1-24.
- Swiatek, M. A. (2002). Social coping among gifted elementary school students. *Journal for the Education of the Gifted*, 26(1), 65-86. <https://doi.org/10.1177/016235320202600104>
- Talas, S., Talas, Y. & Sönmez, A. (2013). Bilim sanat merkezlerine devam eden üstün yetenekli öğrencilerin okullarında yaşadıkları problemler. [Problems experienced by gifted students who attend science and art centers in their schools.]. *Uluslararası Türk Eğitim Bilimleri Dergisi*, 2013(1), 42-50.
- Ural, O., & Kanlıklıçer, P. (2010). Behavioral problems in turkish preschool-age children. *Gifted Education International*, 26(1), 51-60. <https://doi.org/10.1177/026142941002600108>
- Vallerand, R. J., Gagné, F., Senécal, C., & Pelletier, L. G. (1994). A Comparison of the school intrinsic motivation and perceived competence of gifted and regular students. *Gifted Child Quarterly*, 38(4), 172-175. <https://doi.org/10.1177/001698629403800403>
- van der Meulen, R. T., van der Bruggen, C. O., Spilt, J. L., Verouden, J., Berkhout, M., & Bögels, S. M. (2014). The pullout program day a week school for gifted children: effects on social-

emotional and academic functioning. *Child & Youth Care Forum*, 43(3), 287-314.. Springer US. DOI: 10.1007/s10566-013-9239-5

Vialle, W., Heaven, P. C., & Ciarrochi, J. (2007). On being gifted, but sad and misunderstood: Social, emotional, and academic outcomes of gifted students in the Wollongong Youth Study. *Educational Research and Evaluation*, 13(6), 569-586. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13803610701786046>

Wai, J., Lubinski, D., & Benbow, C. P. (2005). Creativity and occupational accomplishments among intellectually precocious youths: An age 13 to age 33 longitudinal study. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 97, 484–492. doi:10.1037/0022-0663.97.3.484

Yıldırım, F. (2012). Üstün yetenekli çocuklar ve ailelerinde duygusal ve davranışsal özellikler. [Emotional and behavioral characteristics of gifted children and their families]. (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Dokuz Eylül Üniversitesi Tıp Fakültesi Çocuk ve Ergen Ruh Sağlığı ve Hastalıkları Anabilim Dalı, İzmir, Türkiye.

Zeidner, M., & Shani-Zinovich, I. (2011). Do academically gifted and nongifted students differ on the Big-Five and adaptive status? Some recent data and conclusions. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 51(5), 566-570. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2011.05.007>