Иновације у настави, XXXV, 2022/3, стр. 11–25
DOI: 10.5937/inovacije2203011L

UDK 371.212.71-057.874
159.923.38

Рад примљен: 21. 4. 2022.
Рад прихваћен: 18. 8. 2022.

Milena M. Letić Lungulov[1],
Biljana S. Lungulov, Jovana J. Milutinović
Faculty of Philosophy, University of Novi Sad, Novi Sad, Serbia

Оригинални научни рад

Personality Traits as Predictors of the Academic Achievement of Gifted Students

***Summary**: This study explores the predictive effects of several personality traits on academic achievement of gifted students. It is hypothesized that, interacting with their cognitive abilities, the spectrum of personality traits (in)directly determines differences in the level of academic achievement. On a sample of 473 students from Serbia, gifted in music, visual arts, sports and mathematics, several inventories were applied: Big Five Inventory, Pre-conscious Activity Scale, MOP 2002, Inventory of Moral Competencies, and Inventory of Emotional Competencies. The validation of the scales was conducted and the contribution of personality traits to the criterion variable was tested by standard multiple regression. Results showed that personality traits explained about 7% of the variance of the gifted students' performance, and that different personality variables predicted the academic performance in different domains of giftedness. Although the determining effect of the examined variables was demonstrated, all causal conclusions referring to personality traits as predictors of academic achievement should be taken with caution. The obtained results provide new possibilities for research in the field of the non-intellectual sphere concerning the gifted students, and indicate new dimensions that should be taken into account during pedagogical work.*

***Keywords**: basic personality dimensions, originality/creativity, motive of achievement, moral properties, emotional intelligence*

1 milenaletic@ff.uns.ac.rs

Introduction

The most common definitions indicate that giftedness implies superior academic achievement and significant intellectual accomplishments, whereby a gifted person is not only someone who possesses great potential but also someone whose adaptation and achievements are remarkable despite all obstacles and limitations (Whitmore, 1980). The literature suggests that the academic achievement of the gifted students is dominantly determined by cognitive abilities, but that they rarely explain more than half the variance of the criterion variable (Chamorro-Premuzic & Furnham, 2008). Such results indicate the necessity to supplement the cognitive abilities with factors from non-cognitive aspects. Most of the research accomplishes this addition by the inclusion of environmental variables and/or affective-motivational aspects (Pekić, 2011a). Some research (Rayneri, Gerber, & Wiley, 2006) confirmed that most gifted students achieve high academic achievement despite the fact that they perceive the educational system incompatible with their own learning style; the environment in which these students functioned did not seem as important as their personal will to consistently achieve good performance and fulfill tasks, regardless of the level of challenges. Such findings indicate that this phenomenon could be linked to the specific personality traits of a person who achieves high academic achievement. However, the review of the relevant literature suggests a lack of research studies regarding non-intellectually gifted individuals (Peperkorn & Wegner, 2020).

Early research found that gifted students were superior to the rest of the population not only in terms of mental abilities (school achievement, interests, professional performance), but also in terms of many characteristics that are not directly related to intelligence (Terman & Oden, 1959). Additionally, in Terman's longitudinal research (Pekić, 2011b; Winner, 1996), it was found that intellectually gifted respondents are more emotionally stable, socially adaptable, less prone to antisocial behavior, and more advanced in terms of moral reasoning.

The studies that determine the factors of the academic achievement of gifted students in the area of different personality dimensions show that the traits in the domain of *the Big Five* model are significant predictors of success at school at all levels of education (Mammadov, Cross & Olszewski-Kubilius, 2021; Poropat, 2009). At the same time, the traits *conscientiousness* (O'Connor & Paunonen, 2007) and *openness to experience* (Laidra, Pullmann, & Allik, 2007; Wirthwein, Bergold, Preckel & Steinmayr, 2019) are consistently presented as the most powerful predictors of the academic achievement of the gifted. Most research suggests that the traits *cooperativeness* and *academic achievement* are not related (Chamorro-Premuzic & Furnham, 2003), and when it comes to *neuroticism* and *extraversion*, the results are quite inconsistent (O'Connor & Paunonen, 2007).

The inconsistency of empirical findings is also present concerning the proportion of creativity in the school achievement of gifted students. While some studies show that creativity and academic achievement are not related (Arya & Maury, 2016; Naderi, Abdullah, Aizan, Sharir, & Kumar, 2010), other studies suggest that highly creative students achieve better results at school (Nami, Marsooli, & Ashouri, 2014; Palaniappan, 2005). Although there is no definitive answer to the question of how important creativity is for the achievement of academic excellence (Karwowski et al., 2020), it seems reasonable to assume that these contradictions are the consequence of creativity being "sensitive" to a specific area of knowledge (Pekić, 2011b). Taking into account the fact that different fields of creative activity (e.g., theoretical physics or painting) require different levels of intelligence (Sternberg & O'Hara, 2000), it is reasonable to believe that the contents of different teaching subjects engage the creative abilities of students in an unequal degree. Hence, it can be assumed that the involvement of creativity in ac-

ademic performance changes in the function of a specific area of knowledge (Pekić, 2011b).

In addition to the need for knowledge, which should be inherent in giftedness, the academic achievement requires a developed motive for achievement and built self-regulation skills that are not inherent in all gifted students (Altaras, 2006). Terman established that the group of the most successful and the group of the least successful participants of the study (with IQs above 140) significantly differ in terms of achievement motives (Terman & Oden, 1959), while later studies of the performance of gifted students mostly confirmed these conclusions (McCoach, 2002; Peters, Grager-Loidl, & Supplee, 2000).

Since gifted children show an early potential for becoming morally responsible persons (Roeper & Silverman, 2009), moral sensitivity is central in the experience of the gifted (Tirri, 2010), and it is associated with high intelligence and abstract thinking (Silverman, 1994). The results of the research indicate that gifted students achieve better results than their peers in terms of moral reasoning (Narváez, 1993), and that they are more pro-socially oriented (Simmons & Zumpf, 1986). In the studies exploring the relationship between moral attributes and academic achievement, morality is most often conceptualized by the term "character", which is accomplished through the examination of dimensions of sincerity, empathy, justice, altruism, idealism, and such (Berkowitz & Hoppe, 2009). The schools which have introduced the "character education" programs, or incorporated certain essentially ethical values into their curricula, have shown better results on standardized academic performance tests (Benninga, Berkowitz, Kuehn, & Smith, 2003; Elias, White, & Stepney, 2014; Snyder et al., 2009).

The research studies on emotions of the gifted and their psychological well-being show contradictory results, emphasizing that, on the one hand, giftedness increases the resilience of an individual, but that, on the other hand, it can also increase their vulnerability (Neihart, 1999). Some studies show that the gifted students actually achieve higher scores on emotional intelligence tests than other students (Abdulla Alabbasi, Ayoub, & Ziegler, 2020; Zeidner, Shani-Zinovich, Matthews, & Roberts, 2005). Also, high emotional intelligence of the gifted can contribute to a better organization of emotions in relation to their peers (Mayer, 2005), while lower scores could be associated with negative behavior in everyday life (Brackett, Mayer, & Warner, 2004). Daniel Goleman (1995) suggests that emotional intelligence contributes to better learning and academic achievement. However, the research showed that it does not contribute to better academic achievement of the gifted students (Woitaszewski & Aalsma, 2004).

Despite the multiple treatments of this issue, the question of the proportion of personality traits in the prediction of the academic achievements of the gifted is still open. It is noted that all research is primarily focused on finding universal predictors of this variable, which neglects the specificity of personal factors in relation to the domain of manifestation of giftedness. This raises a question: is the connection between personality traits and school achievement changing in the function of different domains of giftedness? Having in mind the fact that the domains mutually differ in their content and structure, and that the domain-specific quality of giftedness is not reflected only in the development of certain types of abilities, but also in different combinations of personality traits (Pekić, 2011a), it is reasonable to assume that different constellations of personal properties contribute to the academic excellence of students in different domains.

Present Study

The main goal of this study is to explore the explicit contribution of the predictor model of the academic achievement of the gifted high school students which combines individual personality traits:

basic personality dimensions, a tendency for originality and creativity, a motive of achievement, moral qualities, and emotional intelligence. Therefore, based on the previous research (Lee & Olszewski-Kubilius, 2006; McCoach, 2002; Palaniappan, 2005; Poropat, 2009), it is hypothesized that a relatively wide spectrum of personality traits, in interaction with cognitive abilities, (in)directly determines differences concerning the level of academic achievement among the gifted students in different domains.

In this research, academic achievement is operationalized through school achievement – expressed by the average grade of students in all subjects (GPA), as well as participation and awards in competitions. Depending on the level of competition in which the student participated, the appropriate point was awarded (lowest level - 1 point, for each subsequent level one point more), taking into account whether the respondent won one of the first three prizes (first prize - 0.3 points, second prize- 0.2 points, third prize 0.1 points).

Method

Sample

The research was conducted on a sample of 473 respondents who attended 10 specialized secondary schools for the gifted from Novi Sad, Belgrade, and Kraljevo (Serbia). The research included students from 5 schools for musically gifted, 2 schools for students gifted in visual arts, 1 school for gifted in sport, 1 school for mathematically gifted, and 1 school for sport and mathematically gifted students (Table 1).

The sample, although convenient, had a satisfactory degree of representativeness: the students had to take the entrance exams which included tests of specific skills, where the prescribed minimum points required for enrollment actually means that candidates must have developed specific skills in comparison to the average population.

Instruments

The Big Five Inventory (BFI) (John & Srivastava, 1999) was used to estimate basic personality dimensions. This 44-item scale (e.g. I see myself as a person who is creative), which was created as an attempt to operationalize the constructs of the *Big*

Table 1. Socio-demographic characteristics of the participants

Socio-demographic characteristics		Frequencies	%
Domein of giftedness	Music	102	21.6
	Visual arts	96	20.3
	Mathematics	123	26.0
	Sport	152	32.1
Gender	Male	206	43.6
	Female	267	56.4
Age	15	98	20.7
	16	131	27.7
	17	115	24.3
	18	92	19.5
	19	37	7.8

Five model, proved to be a satisfactory measure of dimensions covered by the aforementioned model (John, Naumann, & Soto, 2008). In the previous research, reliability coefficients (α) ranged from .72 for the scale Agreeableness, to .80 for the scale Openness to experience.

The Scale of Pre-conscious Activity (SPA), created by Holland and Baird (1968), was designed to provide a general measure of originality/creativity, where a high score on this scale implied the efficiency of an individual in the use of one's own preconceptions, which, among other things, implied the acceptance of daydreaming and irrationality as a source of ideas, a greater inclination of expressiveness and creativity, independence of opinion and tolerance for independent and ambiguous contents. The scale consisted of 38 items (e.g. I like to solve problems which have precise answers), and its reliability was about .75.

The motive of achievement was measured by the MOP 2002 instrument, created by Franceško, Mihić and Bala (2002). The instrument was composed as a Likert type scale, consisted of 55 items arranged in four sub-scales (e.g. In everything I do, I try to be the best). Each of the sub-scales measured one of the components of a general motive of achievement (competition with other people, persistence in achieving the goal, achieving goals as a source of satisfaction, and orientation towards planning). The verification of the MOP 2002 by using factor analysis (the promax rotation) confirmed the similar, but not identical factor structure as in the original study. The value of the Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO) was .925, and the value of Bartlett's Test of Sphericity was statistically significant ($p < .001$). Three (out of four) factors, which together explained 38.94% of the variance of the set of manifest variables, were extracted as follows: *competition with others* (α = .87), *persistence in achieving the goal* (α = .83), and *orientation towards planning* (α = .73).

An adapted version of the Moral Competency Inventory (MCI), created by Lennick and Kiel (2011), was used for the assessment of moral properties. The instrument had 50 items arranged in four sub-scales (integrity, responsibility, compassion and forgiveness) (e.g. People around me think I am an honest person). The verification of the MCI by using the factor analysis (the principal axis method) confirmed the identical factor structure as in the original study. The obtained Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO) was .852, while the Bartlett's Test of Sphericity value was statistically significant ($p < .001$). After the elimination of items with loadings below .30, the final solution contained 32 items. The four-factor solution was retained: *integrity* (α = .79), *responsibility* (α = .74), *compassion* (α = .77) and *forgiveness* (α = .70) which explained 32.41% of the common variance of the input set of variables.

Based on the conclusions of certain authors that emotional intelligence is a dynamic category that should be understood contextually (Gardner & Sough, 2002; Palmer, Walls, Burgess, & Stough, 2001), the instrument, which was adjusted to the sociocultural conditions and educational context of Serbia, was constructed for this research. The instrument initially consisted of 90 items in the form of a Likert type scale (1 = strongly disagree, 5 = strongly agree). The operationalization of emotional intelligence and thus the items in the questionnaire were based on Goleman's definition which distinguished four domains: self-awareness, self-control, social awareness, relationship management (Goleman, Boyatzis, & McKee, 2013). The items were formulated closely define the concepts of *self-awareness* (e.g. I believe in what I say and do), *self-control* (e.g. I stay calm and clear-headed even when under a lot of pressure), *social awareness* (e.g. I take care of the needs of group members), and *relationship management* (e.g. I have an inspiring vision that I can easily pass on to other group members). For the verification purposes the factor analysis (the principal axis method) was applied. Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO) was .905, and Bartlett's Test of Sphericity value was statistically significant ($p < .001$). After elimination of the items with loadings below .30, the final so-

lution contained 51 items (α = .93). Four factors were extracted, which explained 32.87% of the common variation of the input set of variables. The factors were named *relationship management* (α = .89), *social awareness* (α = .86), *self-control* (α = .80) and *self-awareness* (α = .71).

Results

The results of the descriptive statistics of all study variables are presented in Table 2. All variables had normal distributions (Skewness and Kurtosis < 1), besides the subscale Self-awareness (kurtosis=1.44). Thus, the distributions are considered normal.

Since the research was planned in a way that personality traits were treated as predictors of the academic achievement of the gifted students in all domains, their contribution to the criterion variable was tested by standard multiple regression. In order to avoid the bulkiness of predictor models, the backward step method was used in the applied regression analysis procedure, which reduces a large number of initial predictor variables to the optimum. In this paper the results of the last, eleventh iteration, performed within the backward method of regression analysis was presented. Breusch–Pagan test for each regression model was applied; results showed that test for all models is insignificant which indicates that the variances of the errors are the same, i.e. that there is no heteroskedasticity.

The results of the multiple regression analysis, which has the academic achievement of gifted students as a criterion variable in four specified domains, revealed that the multi-correlation coefficient was statistically significant at the level $p < .01$, which implied the existence of a linear connection between a set of predictors taken together and the academic achievement as criteria variable. Based on the value of the determination coefficient, it was concluded that the tested properties explain 7% of the variance of gifted students' academic achievement. The values and directions of partial contributions of predictor variables considering all the tested domains of giftedness, as well as specific domains of giftedness, are presented in Table 4.

Additionally, the results showed that personality traits of musically gifted students explained

Table 2. Descriptive statistics of the variables

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
Integrity	473	2.92	4.75	4.00	.37
Responsibility	473	2.43	5.00	3.62	.42
Compassion	473	1.86	4.86	3.67	.51
Forgiveness	473	1.33	5.00	3.78	.64
Relationship management	473	1.80	4.93	3.61	.55
Social awareness	473	2.50	5.00	3.97	.51
Self-control	473	1.25	5.00	3.67	.69
Self-awareness	473	2.38	4.69	3.42	.35
Competition with others	473	1.72	4.78	3.57	.63
Persistence	473	2.57	4.87	3.99	.43
Planning	473	1.56	4.78	3.33	.52
Extraversion	473	1.63	5.00	3.69	.68
Agreeableness	473	2.11	5.00	3.86	.56
Conscientiousness	473	1.44	5.00	3.47	.67
Neuroticism	473	1.00	4.50	2.68	.74
Openness to experience	473	2.00	5.00	3.91	.60

Table 3. Multiple Correlation Coefficients

Domain of giftedness	N	R	R^2	CorrectedR^2	Standard error	F	p
All	473	.266	.071	.057	.10820	5.068	.000**
Music	102	.298	.089	.061	.794	3.179	.027*
Visual arts	96	.340	.116	.077	1.036	2.973	.023*
Mathematics	123	.326	.107	.092	.829	7.156	.001**
Sports	152	.145	.021	.014	.279	3.208	.075

Note: ** p < 0.01, * p < 0.05.

Table 4. Standardized Regression Coefficients

Domain of giftedness	N	Predictors	β	t	p
All	473	Integrity	.181	3.390	.001**
		Social awareness	-.110	-2.248	.025*
		Self-control	-.180	-2.939	.003**
		Neuroticism	-.128	-2.272	.024*
		Extraversion	-.093	-1.811	.071
		Openness	.131	2.744	.006**
		Tendency for originality and creativity	.081	1.736	.083
Music	102	Integrity	.199	1.769	.080
		Self-awareness	-.200	-1.741	.085
		Competition with others	-.199	-2.020	.046*
Visual arts	96	Self-control	-.298	-2.233	.028*
		Tendency for originality and creativity	.177	1.765	.081
Mathematics	123	Responsibility	.248	2.538	.012*
		Conscientiousness	.359	3.669	.001**

Note: ** p < 0.01, * p < 0.05.

about 9% of the variance of their academic achievement. When it comes to students gifted in visual arts it was indicated that the examined properties explained about 12% of the variance in their academic achievement. Similarly, personality traits of mathematically gifted students explained about 11% of the variance in their academic achievement (Table 3). However, the results of the multiple regression analysis concerning the academic achievement of sports gifted students pointed out that there was no statistically significant correlation with the criterion variable (Table 3). Consequently, it was concluded that there was no effect of personality traits on academic achievement of students gifted in sports.

Discussion

As a part of this research aimed at predicting the academic achievement of gifted students based on personality traits, the results show that about 7% of variations in the academic achievement of the gifted can be explained by differences in personality traits. The results of other research indicated that about 14% of the variance of academic achieve-

ment of students may be explained by personality traits (Komarraju, Karau, & Schmeck, 2009), or even a quarter of the variance in secondary school students (Furnham, Monsen, & Ahmetoglu, 2009). Additionally, some studies showed that personality traits and academic performance changes from childhood to adolescence, while indicating that relations between those variables are stable and predictable for students in high school and college (Andersen, Gensowski, Ludeke, & John, 2020). However, the aforementioned studies have primarily examined the non-cognitive components of the academic achievement of all students, without a special reference to gifted population.

The obtained results indicate that the academic achievement of gifted students relies on the following constellation of variables: *emphasized integrity, low level of social awareness, self-control, neuroticism,* and *high level of openness*. The achievement of gifted students in the school context has proved to have a high level of integrity ($p < .001$), which basically implies a sense of duty. Persistence in performing the tasks with a high academic achievement as the outcome could be linked to the performance of external incentives which were perceived as an imposed obligation. The deficient level of social awareness, as well as low receptivity regarding their own feelings (self-control), was also in the function of persistence in performing the tasks. Namely, besides being guided by a sense of duty, the students who were successful at school persisted in carrying out relevant activities because they either had some kind of resistance to events which could create disruptive influence, or they had a source in the external reality (social awareness), or they were attached to the intrapsychic plan (self-control). Academic achievement was partly explained by the domain of neuroticism that negatively correlated with this variable, which was a contradictory finding. An explanation of the simultaneous representation of a trait that suggested a low inhibition of aggression (self-control) and a trait that suggested a good control of instincts and impulses (neuroticism) was based on the assumption that it was an aggression that was not manifested as an instinct or an impulse, but that it was about some type of pro-socially modulated aggression that could be explained with the expression *piercing*. Bearing in mind that achievement related to school implied certain "rules of the game" (implicit knowledge), which were adopted alongside the formal training and which involved familiarization with the strategies of "piercing" at school (Subotnik & Jarvin, 2005); the trait of piercing could be related to the efficiency in mastering these rules.

The results of the research also show that the prediction of the academic achievement is possible if one takes into account a prominence of the trait *openness*, which was defined as "breadth, depth, and openness of consciousness" (McCrae, 1996, p. 323). For closer understanding of the meaning of this trait, it is important to emphasize that it operated in a constellation in which the trait *integrity* had a significant correlation with the criterion. This imposes the need for a different interpretation of the openness of the mind than the usual one. In this case, it was about openness to the adoption of teaching contents which, given their high structure, are rather "conventional" and, as such, did not imply a possibility of the critical review. Such an interpretation of the trait *openness of the mind* resembled the descriptions of the personal traits which are referred to as "upbringing ability" (Subotnik & Jarvin, 2005).

The examination of the influence of personality traits of musically gifted students showed that their academic achievement was largely determined by *competing with others* ($p < .046$), with which this property negatively correlated. A poor tendency to compete with others, which could be described as a preference for easier tasks in which minimal effort is needed in order to have a priority over other individuals engaged in the same tasks (Tassi & Schneider, 1997), supported the fact that the achievement of musicians in the school framework implied the development of the motivation for competitions

which is referred to in the literature as a competition with oneself (Udvari & Schneider, 2000).

The results showed that the trait that best predicts an academic achievement of students gifted in visual arts can be described as *a poor ability to control oneself* ($p < .028$). *The tendency towards originality and creativity s*howed an inclination to influence the academic achievement of this group of respondents ($p < .081$). The poor control of oneself and one's own emotions can be related to the trait of *non-conventionality*, which is typical for artistic domains of giftedness (Csikszentmihalyi, Rathunde, Whalen, & Wong, 1993). Bearing in mind that the achievement in visual arts relies on the preference for innovation and diversity in relation to the routine and the desire to consider new, unconventional ideas (Feist, 1999), it became clear why the disposition to originality showed a tendency towards the prediction of the academic achievement of these students.

The results of the research showed that the academic achievement of mathematically gifted students implied a specific set of traits which could be described in terms of emphasized *responsibility* and *conscientiousness*. Mastering a domain of mathematics, which is qualified as a highly structured academic domain of giftedness, requires an intense disciplined tendency toward set goals. Apart from binding to a better organization in fulfilling obligations and a tendency to carefully consider the potential "next steps", these traits also implicate a high motivation for mastering relevant school activities. The academic achievement of mathematically gifted students implied a development of the kind of motivation that is called *orientation to a task or commitment to a task* (Winner, 1996), relevant for intrinsic motivation.

When it comes to sports gifted students, it has been found that their personal traits do not show a statistically significant relation to their academic achievement. The obtained results were not in accordance with the results of other studies (Cox, 2012) which indicated that athletes possess certain specificities in personality structure in relation to other persons, and that the individuals who systematically and continuously deal with sports differ not only from non-athletes, but also from the less successful athletes. However, in this research, the specified variables of personality traits showed the statistically significant correlation with the criterion, which could be explained by the operationalization of the variable criterion. Namely, it is true that success in the field of sports is not as much expressed in school as in extracurricular and other activities, for which the indicators are certainly not school grades. Therefore, it could be assumed that this is precisely the reason for the impossibility of predicting the academic success of athletes based on the studied personality characteristics.

Regarding the limitations of this research, it is important to say that the research included gifted students who were classified in a particular category based on their attendance of specialized high schools for the gifted. Therefore, it is not possible to generalize the obtained results to all gifted students in specific domains. Another limitation relates to the very nature of the draft; the traits that had shown a certain relationship with the criterion variable cannot be interpreted without reserves as the predictors of the academic achievement of gifted students. Therefore, in future research it would be important to use a longitudinal draft that would allow an insight into causal relationships between personality traits and academic achievement. In addition to personality traits, the future research should include intellectual ability tests in order to compare the relative contribution of personality traits and intelligence to the prediction of the academic achievement.

Conclusion

The aim of the research was to examine the percentage of variance in the academic achievement of gifted students, which can be explained by

the predictive model of the stated personality traits, as well as the establishment of the constellation of the examined variables that can best predict the academic performance of the gifted students in different domains. The results of the research suggested that the contribution of these dimensions is significant because it indicated that the academic achievement of the gifted is not exclusively of ability nature, implying that the gifted individuals cannot be comprehensively described without considering the non-cognitive aspects of personality. It was concluded that the academic achievement in the school context can be predicted on the basis of the traits associated with some kind of resistance to internal and external activity distracters, which are related to the incursion and tendency to act according to predetermined rules; it is possible with certain reliability to foresee excellence in the academic achievement of the gifted student who has an emphasized integrity, a low level of social awareness, self-control, and neuroticism, and a high level of openness.

When considering the specific domains of manifestation of giftedness, the findings point to the decisive role of the *competition with oneself* in predicting the academic achievement of musically gifted students; school achievement in the field of visual arts is mostly determined by the *poor ability to control oneself and one's emotions*. The academic achievement of mathematically gifted students is best predicted by the traits such as *responsibility* and *conscientiousness,* while the school achievement of sports gifted students has not shown a significant relation with the studied traits. The obtained results suggest that educational work with gifted individuals should be formulated in such a way that, while stimulating the development of abilities, the relevant personality traits are built as well.

References

- Abdulla Alabbasi A. M. A., Ayoub A. E. A. & Ziegler, A. (2020). Are gifted students more emotionally intelligent than their non-gifted peers? A meta-analysis. *High Ability Studies,* 32, 189–217. http://www.doi.org/10.1080/13598139.2020.1770704
- Altaras, A. (2006). *Darovitost i podbacivanje*. Pančevo: Mali Nemo.
- Andersen, S. C., Gensowski, M., Ludeke, S. G. & John, O. P. (2020). A stable relationship between personality and academic performance from childhood through adolescence. An original study and replication in hundred-thousand-person samples. *Journal of Personality*, 88 (5), 925–939. http://www.doi.org/10.1111/jopy.12538
- Arya, M. & Maury, S. P. (2016). Relationship between creativity, intelligence and academic achievement among school going children. *Studies on Home and Community Science*, 10 (1–3), 1–7. http://www.doi.org/10.1080/09737189.2016.11885359
- Berkowitz, M. W. & Hoppe, M. A. (2009). Character education and gifted children. *High Ability Studies*, 20 (2), 131–142. http://www.doi.org/10.1080/13598130903358493
- Benninga, J. S., Berkowitz, M. W., Kuehn, P. & Smith, K. (2003). The relationship of character education implementation and academic achievement in elementary schools. *Journal of Research in Character Education*, 1 (1), 19–32.
- Brackett, M. A., Mayer, J. D. & Warner, R. M. (2004). Emotional intelligence and its relation to everyday behavior. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 36 (6), 1387–1402. http://www.doi.org/10.1016/S0191-8869(03)00236-8
- Chamorro-Premuzic, T. & Furnham, A. (2003). Personality traits and academic examination performance. *European Journal of Personality*, 17 (3), 237–250. http://www.doi.org/10.1002/per.473

- Chamorro-Premuzic, T. & Furnham, A. (2008). Personality, intelligence and approaches to learning as predictors of academic performance. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 44 (7), 1596–1603. http://www.doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2008.01.003
- Cox, R. (2012). *Sport psychology: Concepts and applications* (7th ed.). Boston, MA: McGraw-Hill.
- Csikszentmihalyi, M., Rathunde, K. R., Whalen, S. & Wong, M. (1993). *Talented teenagers: The roots of success and failure.* New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Elias, M. J., White, G. & Stepney, C. (2014). Surmounting the challenges of improving academic performance: Closing the achievement gap through social emotional and character development. *Journal of Urban Learning, Teaching, and Research*, 10, 14–24.
- Feist, G. J. (1999). The influence of personality on artistic and scientific creativity. In: Sternberg, R. J. (Ed.). *Handbook of creativity* (271–294). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Franceško, M., Mihić, V. i Bala, G. (2002). Struktura motiva postignuća merena skalom MOP 2002. In: Franceško, M., Čukić, B. (Eds.). *Ličnost u višekulturnom društvu* (134–143). Novi Sad: Filozofski fakultet.
- Furnham, A., Monsen, J. & Ahmetoglu, G. (2009). Typical intellectual engagement, Big Five personality traits, approaches to learning and cognitive ability predictors of academic performance. *British Journal of Educational Psychology*, 79 (4), 769–782. http://www.doi.org/10.1348/978185409X412147
- Gardner, W. L. & Stough, C. (2002). Examining the relationship between leadership and emotional intelligence in senior level managers. *Leadership and Organization Development Journal*, 23 (2), 68–78. http://www.doi.org/10.1108/01437730210419198
- Goleman, D. (1995). *Emotional intelligence*. New York: Bantam Books.
- Goleman, D., Boyatzis, E. R. & McKee, A. (2013). *Primal leadership: Unleashing the power of emotional intelligence*. Boston, Massachusetts: Harvard Business Press.
- Holland, J. L. & Baird, L. L. (1968). The preconscious activity scale: The development and validation of an originality measure. *Journal of Creative Behavior*, 2 (3), 217–226. http://www.doi.org/10.1002/j.2162-6057.1968.tb00106.x
- John, O. P. & Srivastava, S. (1999). The Big Five trait taxonomy: History, measurement, & theoretical perspectives. In: Pervin, L. A. & John, O. P. (Eds.). *Handbook of personality: Theory and research* (102–138). New York: The Guilford Press.
- John, O. P., Naumann, L. P. & Soto, C. J. (2008). Paradigm shift to the integrative Big Five trait taxonomy: history, measurement, and conceptual issues. In: John, O. P., Robins, R. W. & Pervin, L. A. (Eds.). *Handbook of personality: Theory and research* (114–158). New York: The Guilford Press.
- Karwowski, M., Jankowska, D. M., Brzeski, A., Czerwonka, M., Gajda, A., Lebuda, I. & Beghetto, R. A. (2020). Delving into Creativity and Learning. *Creativity Research Journal*, 32 (1), 4–16. http://www.doi.org/10.1080/10400419.2020.1712165
- Komarraju, M., Karau, S. & Schmeck, R. R. (2009). Role of the Big Five personality traits in predicting college students' academic motivation and achievement. *Learning and Individual Differences*, 19 (1), 47–52. http://www.doi.org/10.1016/j.lindif.2008.07.001
- Laidra, K., Pullmann, H. & Allik J. R. (2007). Personality and intelligence as predictors of academic achievement: A cross-sectional study from elementary to secondary school. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 42 (3), 441–451. http://www.doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2006.08.001

- Lee, S. Y. & Olszewski-Kubilius, P. (2006). The emotional intelligence, moral judgment, and leadership of academically gifted adolescents. *Journal for the Education of the Gifted*, 30 (1), 29–67. http://www.doi.org/10.1177/016235320603000103
- Lennick, D., & Kiel, F. (2011). *Moral intelligence 2.0: Enhancing business performance and leadership success in turbulent times*. Boston: Pearson Education.
- Mammadov, S., Cross, T. L. & Olszewski-Kubilius, P. (2021). A look beyond aptitude: The relationship between personality traits, autonomous motivation, and academic achievement in gifted students. *Roeper Review*, 43 (3), 161–172. http://www.doi.org/10.1080/02783193.2021.1923595
- Mayer, R. E. (2005). The scientific study of giftedness. In: Sternberg, R. J. & Davidson, J. E. (Eds.). *Conceptions of giftedness* (437–447). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. http://www.doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511610455.025
- McCoach, D. B. (2002). A validation study of the school attitude assessment survey. *Measurement and Evaluation in Counseling and Development,* 35 (2), 66–77. http://www.doi.org/10.1080/07481756.2002.12069050
- McCrae, R. R. (1996). Social consequences of experiential openness. *Psychological Bulletin*, 120 (3), 323–337. http://www.doi.org/10.1037/0033-2909.120.3.323
- Nami, Y., Marsooli, H. & Ashouri, M. (2014). The relationship between creativity and academic achievement. *Procedia – Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 114, 36–39. http://www.doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2013.12.652
- Naderi, H., Abdullah, R., Aizan, H.T., Sharir, J. & Kumar, V. (2010). Relationship between creativity and academic achievement: A study of gender differences. *Journal of American Science*, 6 (1), 181–190.
- Narváez, D. (1993). High achieving students and moral judgment. *Journal for the Education of the Gifted*, 16 (3), 268–279. http://www.doi.org/10.1177/016235329301600304
- Neihart, M. (1999). The impact of giftedness on psychological well-being: What does the empirical literature say? *Roeper Review*, 22 (1), 10–17. http://www.doi.org/10.1080/02783199909553991
- O'Connor, M. C. & Paunonen, S. V. (2007). Big Five personality predictors of post-secondary academic performance. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 43 (5), 971–990. http://www.doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2007.03.017
- Palaniappan, A. K. (2005). *Creativity and academic achievement: A Malaysian perspective*. Shah Alam: Karisma Publications.
- Palmer, B., Walls, M., Burgess, Z. & Stough, C. (2001). Emotional intelligence and effective leadership. *Leadership and Organization Development Journal,* 22 (1), 5–10. http://www.doi.org/10.1108/01437730110380174
- Pekić, J. (2011a). Relacije kreativnosti i školskog postignuća u kontekstu različitih akademskih domena. *Primenjena psihologija*, 4 (3), 295–306.
- Pekić, J. (2011b). *Karakteristike porodica sa akademski darovitim adolescentom* (*neobjavljena doktorska disertacija)*. Novi Sad: Filozofski fakultet.
- Peperkorn, C. & Wegner, C. (2020). The big-five-personality and academic self-concept in gifted and non-gifted students: A systematic review of literature. *International Journal of Research in Education and Science (IJRES)*, 6 (4), 649–667. http://www.doi.org/10.46328/ijres.v6i4.1290
- Peters, W. A. M., Grager-Loidl, H. & Supplee, P. (2000). Underachievement in gifted children and adolescents: Theory and practice. In: Heller, K. A., Mönks, F. J., Subotnik, R. & Sternberg, R. J. (Eds.). *International handbook of giftedness and talent* (2nd ed.) (609–620). Oxford: Elsevier. http://www.doi.org/10.1016/B978-008043796-5/50043-7

- Poropat, A. E. (2009). A meta-analysis of the five-factor model of personality and academic performance. *Psychological Bulletin*, 135 (2), 322–338. http://www.doi.org/10.1037/a0014996
- Rayneri, L. J., Gerber, B. L. & Wiley, L. P. (2006). The relationship between classroom environment and the learning style preferences of gifted middle school students and the impact on levels of performance. *Gifted Child Quarterly*, 50 (2), 104–118. http://www.doi.org/10.1177/001698620605000203
- Roeper, A. & Silverman, L. K. (2009). Giftedness and moral promise. In: Cross, T. & Ambrose, D. (Eds.). *Morality, ethics, and gifted minds* (251–264). New York: Springer Science + Business Media LLC. http://www.doi.org/10.1007/978-0-387-89368-6_19
- Silverman, L. K. (1994). The moral sensitivity of gifted children and the evolution of society. *Roeper Review*, 17 (2), 110–116. http://www.doi.org/10.1080/02783199409553636
- Simmons, C. H. & Zumpf, C. (1986). The gifted child: perceived competence, prosocial moral reasoning, and charitable donations. *The Journal of Genetic Psychology*, 147 (1), 97–105. http://www.doi.org/10.1080/00221325.1986.9914484
- Snyder, F., Flay, B., Vuchinich, S., Acock, A., Washburn, I., Beets, M. & Li, K. K. (2009). Impact of a social-emotional and character development program on school-level indicators of academic achievement, absenteeism, and disciplinary outcomes: A matched-pair, cluster-randomized, controlled trial. *Journal of Research on Educational Effectiveness*, 3 (1), 26–55. http://www.doi.org/10.1080/19345740903353436
- Sternberg, R. J. & O'Hara, L. A. (2000). Intelligence and creativity. In: Sternberg, R. J. (Ed.). *Handbook of intelligence* (611–630). New York: Cambridge University Press. http://www.doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511807947.028
- Subotnik, R. & Jarvin, L. (2005). Beyond expertise: Conceptions of giftedness as great performance. In: Sternberg, R. J. & Davidson, J. E. (Eds.). *Conceptions of giftedness* (343–358). New York: Cambridge University Press. http://www.doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511610455.020
- Tassi, F. & Schneider, B. H. (1997). Task-oriented versus other-referenced competition: Differential implications for children's peer relations. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 27 (17), 1557–1580. http://www.doi.org/10.1111/j.1559-1816.1997.tb01613.x
- Terman, L. M. & Oden, M. H. (1959). *Genetic studies of genius.* Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- Tirri, K. (2010). Combining excellence and ethics: Implications for moral education for the gifted. *Roeper Review*, 33 (1), 59–64. http://www.doi.org/10.1080/02783193.2011.530207
- Udvari, S. J. & Schneider, B. H. (2000). Competition and the adjustment of gifted children: A matter of motivation. *Roeper Review*, 22 (4), 212–216. http://www.doi.org/10.1080/02783190009554040
- Whitmore, J. R. (1980). *Giftedness, conflict, and underachievement*. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.
- Winner, E. (1996). *Gifted children: Myths and realities*. New York: Basic Books.
- Wirthwein, L., Bergold, S., Preckel, F. & Steinmayr, R. (2019). Personality and school functioning of intellectually gifted and nongifted adolescents: Self-perceptions and parents' assessments. *Learning and Individual Differences*, 73, 16–29. http://www.doi.org/10.1016/j.lindif.2019.04.003
- Woitaszewski, S. A. & Aalsma, M. C. (2004). The contribution of emotional intelligence to the social and academic success of gifted adolescents as measured by the multifactor emotional intelligence scale – adolescent version. *Roeper Review*, 27 (1), 25–30. http://www.doi.org/10.1080/02783190409554285
- Zeidner, M., Shani-Zinovich, I., Matthews, G., & Roberts, R. (2005). Assessing emotional intelligence in gifted and non-gifted high school students: Outcomes depend on the measure. *Intelligence*, 33 (4), 369–391. http://www.doi.org/10.1016/j.intell.2005.03.001

Милена М. Летић Лунгулов

Биљана С. Лунгулов

Јована Ј. Милутиновић

Универзитет у Новом Саду, Филозофски факултет,
Србија, Нови Сад

ПЕРСОНАЛНЕ КАРАКТЕРИСТИКЕ КАО ПРЕДИКТОРИ ШКОЛСКОГ ПОСТИГНУЋА ДАРОВИТИХ УЧЕНИКА

Иако школско постигнуће даровитих ученика представља разрађену област емпиријске експлорације, преглед релевантне литературе показује недовољну истраженост ове проблематике барем у два аспекта. Као прво, с обзиром на то да се схватање оптималних модела предикције школског постигнућа даровитих ученика своди на прилично уопштене препоруке о нужности комбиновања когнитивних и некогнитивних фактора, питање прецизнијег описа оптималних модела предикције, нарочито његовог личносног сегмента, и даље остаје отворено. Друго, уочено је да су савремена истраживања школског постигнућа у популацији даровитих превасходно управљена на изналажење универзалниих чинилаца ове варијабле, чиме се занемарује њихова специфичност у односу на домен манифестовања даровитости. Стога се у овом раду акценат ставља на употпуњавање сазнања о школском постигнућу даровитих ученика у два запостављена аспекта.

Циљ рада односио се на испитивање процента варијансе у школском постигнућу даровитих ученика који се може објаснити предиктивним моделом појединих персоналних карактеристика, као и утврђивање констелације испитиваних варијабли које најбоље предвиђају школску успешност ученика даровитих у различитим доменима. У спецификовању персоналних карактеристика избор је сведен на базичне димензије личности – „великих пет" (неуротицизам, екстраверзија, отвореност, сарадљивост, савесност), склоност ка оригиналности и креативности, мотив постигнућа (такмичење са другим људима, истрајност у остваривању циља, оријентација ка планирању), морална својства (интегритет, одговорност, саосећање, праштање) и емоционалну интелигенцију (самосвест, владање самим собом, друштвена свест, управљање односима). Кад је реч о школском постигнућу, његова операционализација је обављена преко две врсте индикатора: просечна оцена и учешћа и награде на такмичењима. Истраживање је спроведено на узорку од 473 испитаника (123 математички даровита, 152 спортски даровита, 102 музички даровита и 96 ликовно даровитих ученика), који похађају специјализоване средње школе за даровите из Новог Сада, Београда и Краљева. У истраживању су примењени следећи инструменти: инвентар „великих пет", скала предсвесне активности, МОП 2002, инвентар моралних компетенција и инвентар емоционалних компетенција.

Иако добијени резултати указују на то да проучаване карактеристике личности објашњавају само око 7% варијансе школског постигнућа даровитих ученика, у раду се закључује да допринос ових димензија јесте значајан јер говори у прилог томе да школско

постигнуће даровитих није искључиво способносне природе и сугерише да се академски успех даровитих ученика не може обухватно описати ако се не разматрају и некогнитивни аспекти личности. Судећи по налазима спроведеног истраживања, успешност даровитих у школском контексту може се предвидети на основу особина уз које се везује нека врста резистентности на унутрашње и спољне дистракторе активности, а са којима су повезане продорност и пријемчивост за поступање по унапред утврђеним правилима. Закључује се да је са одређеном поузданошћу могуће предвидети изврсност у академском постигнућу даровитог ученика који поседује наглашен интегритет, низак степен друштвене свести, владања самим собом и неуротицизма, те висок ниво отворености. Налази указују и на то да различите личносне варијабле предвиђају школску успешност у различитим доменима даровитости. С тим у вези, у предвиђању школског постигнућа музички даровитих ученика пресудну улогу има такмичење са самим собом; школска успешност у домену сликарства највише је детерминисана оскудном способношћу владања собом и својим емоцијама. Успех у школи спортски даровитих ученика није показао значајну повезаност са проучаваним својствима, док се школско постигнуће математички даровитих ученика најбоље предвиђа особинама попут одговорности и савесности. Такви резултати отварају нове могућности за истраживања у подручју ванинтелектуалне сфере даровитих и указују на нове димензије о којима треба водити рачуна приликом васпитно-образовног рада са њима.

Кључне речи: *базичне димензије личности, емоционална интелигенција, морална својства, мотив постигнућа, оригиналност/креативност*