The Diversity of Self-Representation among High Intellectual Potential Tunisian Adolescents

Nader Zghidi

Faculty of Letters and Humanities of Sfax. Sfax University.
Research unit: Laboratory State, Culture and Society Movements.

Abstract: Research studies dealing with the notion of high potential, particularly, from the young teenagers' view point in Tunisia are obviously scarce. Consequently, we have decided to address the idea of self-concept in this study, as it is considered an important factor in understanding how an individual behaves in his or her life and how he/she lives this experience. More specifically, our objective was to tackle the differentiated self-concept of high-potential boys and girls in mixed classes with IQ scores ≥ 130. To this end, a sample of 100 high-potential students, among which 55 were boys aged between 13 and 19 years old, with an average age of 14.3 and 1.03 standard deviation was selected and interviewed. The used instruments that allowed identifying the self-concept dimensions is based on three criteria: the questionnaires they answered are the SDQII (Marsh, 1990), and the self-description and high potential (Guskin et al., 1986) as well as the G.P.S. (Genesis of Perceptions of the Self) technique (L'Ecuyer, 1990). The obtained results showed that boys are more confident in both their emotional stability and physical skills. Moreover, they increasingly claim their high potential status of adolescents and their personal characteristics, such as talent and gift among others, as well as the subsequent sense of difference. Girls, however, tend to focus on the effort they make to cope with their peers' expectations and school requirements.

Keywords: Self concept; girl-boy comparison; high school students; high intellectual potential.

JEL Classification: I23; I25.

I.   INTRODUCTION

The objective of this exploratory study was to examine the gender specificities that may affect the notion of self-concept among Tunisian high school teenagers - boys and girls - with high intellectual potential (HIP) attending heterogeneous classes. Previous researchers dealing with HIP teenagers have generally focused on the intellectual behavior of these teenagers, trying to particularly characterize their cognitive functioning.

The achieved results also show that such factors as the independent learning, the desire to know and the intrinsic motivation are among the most frequently cited indicators to define the cognitive functioning (Winner, 2003; Gottfried and Gottfried, 2004). The issue of HIP teenagers socio-emotional development is arousing greater interest not only among researchers (Neihart, 1999; Massé and Gagné, 2001; Gallagher, 2003; Moon, 2004; Reis and Renzulli, 2004, Cxourtinat-Camps et al., 2011; Hentati and Elloumi, 2013; Brian, 2015) but also pupils' parents, teachers, practitioners, practicing psychologists, and institutional responsibles (Delaubier, 2002).

One of the major questions about the existence of real specificities is related to those of self-esteem among HIP adolescents. In fact, research has not helped give a definitive answer to the issue so far. However, some of these research studies suggest that HP teenagers do not suffer any major deficit at this point (Hoge and McSheffrey, 1991), while others stress more mixed results (Tong and Yewchuk, 1996). In a meta-analysis involving 50 studies, Hoge and Renzulli (1993) showed that HIP teenagers generally have a much higher level of an overall self-esteem than that of ordinary pupils (with an effect that was around 0.19). Among the studies conducted by Tong and Yewchuk (1996), three studies revealed a high HIP teenagers' overall self-esteem, three others indicated that there is no difference between both groups and two studies showed that the feeling of real love is very low in HIP teenagers.

When self-esteem per sector was tackled, significant differences for HIP teenagers were frequently observed mainly in the academic field self-esteem when compared to other fields, where such differences were practically inexistent (Pyryt and Mendaglio, 1994; Tong and Yewchuk, 1996; Ablard, 1997; McCoach and Siegle, 2003; Yan and Haihui, 2005). Oppositely, Field et al. (1998) did not did not observe any differences between HIP teenagers and ordinary students at the academic skills level.

Several factors contribute to the explanation of this heterogeneity, notably the theoretical and

---

methodological controversies coping with self-esteem, on the one hand, (Byrne, 1996), and the high potential, on the other (Winner, 2000). Moreover, the comparisons, often made between groups of teenagers, are relatively heterogeneous for HIP teenagers but homogeneous for the ordinary adolescents – not considered in this study. Many variables like the educational placement type, development level or sex of the subjects (Hoge and Renzulli, 1993; Neihart, 1999; Massé and Gagné, 2001) do intervene in these studies. As for the gender impact on the HIP teenagers' self-esteem, research studies still reveal contradictory results. In fact, HIP boys most often show a higher global self-esteem than girls (Worrell et al., 1998). In other words, boys consider themselves more talented than their female counterparts (Perrone et al., 2007).

On the other hand, the studies conducted on a group of HIP teenagers, Ablard (1997) and Worrell et al. (1998) found no differences between boys and girls regarding academic self-esteem. Kelly and Jordan (1990), however, claim that boys believe they are more talented than girls at school despite the absence of differences between the sexes regarding school performance. During adolescence, girls, in particular, are not confident in their intellectual capacities as they are not subject to high expectations (Stipeck and MacIver, 1989). As for Dai (2001), he showed that adolescents have very positive school self-esteem. He also found no differences between the sexes regarding self-esteem at mathematics. Contrarily, Norman et al. (1999) indicated that young HIP adolescents have a high score of verbal self-esteem. They also claimed that boys self-esteem at mathematics is higher.

Furthermore, while some studies found no differences between sexes regarding the teenagers' social self-esteem (Pyryt et Mendaglio, 1994; Rinn, 2006), others deduced that teenage girls have a very positive social self esteem (Norman et al., 1999; Worrell et al., 1998). In addition, King et al. (1999) as well as Ninot et al. (2000) believe that teenage girls overestimate their honesty (Norman et al., 1999).

Opposite to (Cornell et al., 1990, Worrell et al., 1998), who found that teenage boys feel more confident about their physical self-concept, Rinn and Wininger (2006), cited by Jamieson (2007), showed that there are no gender differences regarding appearance and physical competences. In fact, when connected with the high potential problem, self-esteem involves a feeling of difference (Cross et al., 1993, Manaster and Powell, 1983), which seems to stem from difficult relationships as well as a low estimation of oneself (Delisle, 1992).

Therefore, teenagers applied different strategies depending on their sex (Chan, 2003, 2004, 2005; Swiatek, 1995, 2001, 2002). According to these authors, boys are more willing to use the mindset and refute the importance of reputation whereas girls are more likely to deny their potential by seeking to meet standards and attaching more attention to their relationship with their friends.

Beyond self-esteem, and in line with the research conducted by Cross et al. (1993), Chan (2003, 2004, 2005) and Swiatek (1995, 2001, 2002), we tried to understand the HIP teenagers' self-esteem concept. This notion is considered as perceptions that an individual has about himself (Shavelon et al., 1976; L'Ecuyer, 1978; Marsh, 1990). These perceptions include self knowledge and assessment as well as the image he believes to offer to his environment (Héroux and Farrell, 1985). This multidimensional and hierarchical self-representation involves the capabilities, emotions, beliefs, values and interests that the subjects are responsible for.

II. SELF-ESTEEM AND HIGH POTENTIAL: THEORETICAL FOUNDATION

The teenage period for the Western countries is characterized by significant changes at the physical level in terms of socio-affective relations and intellectual interests. Being often torn between the desire to grow and the nostalgia to leave childhood, young teenagers are faced with an important development function which is reflected in a deep restructuring of their identity.

In 1980, Pereira-Fradin defines identity as a combination that reflects a dynamic structure of the individual's behavior, such as his needs, abilities, self-concept, convictions, and personal history. The identity building involves the feeling of individuality and that of being recognized by others. The existence of a balance between these two factors can lead to the shaping of a rational identity (Kroger, 2003). A positive self-perception would be one of the required conditions for the building of one's own identity (Erikson, 1980). Actually, self-perception refers to the way an individual identifies himself, defined as a range of representations that reflect the way an individual feels about himself (Markus and Wurf, 1987). Even if some writers retained the term "self-concept" to define the descriptive dimension of self-representation and used the term "self-esteem" to designate the estimated dimension (Marsh and O'Mara, 2008), there are others who supported the idea that self-concept is a generic concept that has both a descriptive and evaluative dimension (Marsh, 1990; Swann, Chang-Schneider and Larsen McClarty, 2007).

This applies, particularly, to the case of the young people with a HIP and whose Intelligence Quotient (IQ) is considered to be equal to or greater than 130 as assessed by a psychologist. Actually, these young people are could design their identity formation, particularly by internalizing or rejecting the principles and values of the interest groups that have been granted to them.

Moreover, research focusing on self-concept among the youngsters having a high intellectual potential focuses, specifically, on its evaluative dimension, while the research that compares the overall students' self-

esteem with a high intellectual potential to those who lack it, reached questionable results. Moreover, some researchers showed that students with a high intellectual potential may have a high self-esteem level (Hoge and McSheffrey, 1991; Hoge and Renzulli, 1993; Van Tassel-Baska and Olszewski-Kubilius Kulieke, 1994), whereas others highlighted different findings like those achieved by (Tong and Yewchuk, 1996), or even contradictory results (Yan and Haihui, 2005). These emphasize the idea that if the assessment of self-esteem is made per sector, there will be significant differences which are clearly observed in terms of students' self-esteem, benefiting students with a high intellectual potential (Rinn and Cunningham, 2008; Rudasill, 2009). Yet, Field et al. (1998) noticed no difference in this field. On the other hand, when the non-academic dimensions of self-concept are not taken into account, the obtained results are heterogeneous (Rinn et al., 2009). These results seem contradictory especially regarding the social self-esteem (Ablard, 1997; Dixon et al., 2001). As for Pyryt and Menda-glio (1994) and Bain and Bell (2004), they found that students with a high intellectual potential show a higher social self-esteem than those without.

Oppositely, Hoge and Renzulli (1993), Ablard (1997) or Field et al. (1998), did not notice any large differences between both cases. In fact, none of them indicated that the young who do not have a high intellectual potential can rate themselves more positively than those who did not enjoy such an esteem in the social field (Hoge and McSheffrey, 1991). Besides the controversy on the theoretical and methodological levels, factors, such as age, sex or the assembly system, contribute to the explanation of these results disparity (Courtinat et al., 2009; Massé and Gagné, 2001).

Regarding the impact of age, the findings are contradictory. While some researchers found that young people at an older age with high intellectual potential show high self-esteem levels (Lewis, Knight, 2000), others revealed higher levels even among the youngest (Crain and Bracken, 1994). As for Lea-Wood and Clunies-Ross (1995), they found no age-related differences in relation to girls with high intellectual potential for the overall self-esteem.

However, student girls with a high intellectual potential feel some kind of self-devaluation due to the changing expectations of parents, school, and society as a whole (Reis, 2002), whereas ingenious boys show a high self-esteem in terms of athletic competence, physical appearance and overall personal value compared to talented girls (Rudasill, 2009). As far as the behavioral dimension is concerned, girls have a very high score (good behavior, and conformity with the rules). Talented boys, however, show a higher emotional stability than smart girls (Cunningham and Rinn, 2007; Rinn et al., 2009). After all we can claim that he differences observed about the gender are similar to those found among the general young population and are also related to gender stereotypes.

III. METHODOLOGY

Our article relied on the Self Description Questionnaire II (SDQ-II) test in its empirical section. Despite being a tricky and delicate topic, measuring intelligence was a need to find out about High Potential subjects. In fact, the SDQII has been widely and commonly applied to many psychology research areas in spite of its length which sometimes limits its utility. This article evaluates in brief, 100-item version of the SDQII on a sample of 100 teenagers among the 112 volunteer Tunisian secondary school students. This choice was made because of incomplete answers for the remaining 12 subjects. It is worth noting that we have adopted different items from several electronic version of the SDQII test available on the internet.

3.1. Participants

Inspired by the work Boschi et al. (2016), our study was performed on 100 HIP Tunisian school students (IQ score ≥ 130) aged between 13 and 19 (average age: 14.3, standard deviation: 1.03) within different Tunisian public schools. Among these 100 teenagers, 55% are boys and 45% girls. Nearly 65% of the subjects belong to a privileged or very privileged socio-cultural background, 20% to a medium background and 15% to a rather underprivileged one. As far as age is concerned, the boys' sample appears to be significantly close to that of girls [t(98)=0.753 ; p=0.45], the attended class [Chi 2=0.723; dl=5; p=0.98], the socio-cultural background [Chi 2=1.692; dl=3; p=0.64], the family status (single child/member of a sibling group) [Chi 2=0.509; dl=1; p=0.48]. The main retained remark was that girls have a more distinguished academic performance (general average of the previous year and the first quarter of the current year [t(98)=-3.996; p=0.00], a smaller proportion of repeaters [Chi 2=2.991; dl=1; p=0.08]).

3.2. Procedure

The data on the subjects were collected through internet forums or via colleagues (researchers) interested in these topics (such as the psychologists who conducted a psychological study without undertaking a follow-up). According to the obtained results, there are some indicators that validate the identification of a high potential. This was acquired through a photocopy of the psychological assessment that included a Wechsler test. Actually, a prior information note and authorization form were sent to the students and parents ensuring them

the anonymity of their responses.

3.3. Instruments

In 1990, the French L'Ecuyer developed the GPS (Genesis of Perceptions of the self) tool where the subject is called to identify himself by answering the question "who am I?". The subject is totally free to describe himself without any constraints. Then, he is given the opportunity to show the most important side of his personality to finally get to know the major self-concept perceptions and characteristics.

The SDQII self-esteem questionnaire (Marsh, 1990; Boschi et al., 2016), which is specifically conceived multidimensional model that helps measure 10 dimensions of the self-esteem concept using 100 items grouped into seven non-academic scales, three academic scales and one global scale (see Table 1). All the factors contain as many positive as negative items. Over the 100 items, the subjects have to be positioned on a Likert-scale ranging from "False - I am not at all like this" to "True - I am totally like this". In the context of this multidimensional measure, the obtained results after the data analysis showed us the rationale of the 10-factor model (through a confirmatory factorial analysis and a hierarchical factorial confirmatory analysis) and the very satisfactory consistency (Cronbach's alpha) of the measured dimensions.

Table 1: The SDQII internal consistency theoretical dimensions and their friability

Variables	Factors	Number of items	Cronbach's alpha
Formal education	General	10	0.895
	Mathematics	10	0.962
	Verbal	10	0.894
Non-formal education	Honesty	10	0.952
	Physical abilities	10	0.902
	physical appearance	10	0.831
	Emotional stability	10	0.853
	Relations with parents	10	0.876
	Relations with pairs of the same-sex	10	0.932
	Relations with pairs of the opposite sex	10	0.789
	Global	10	0.852

Source: Authors' estimation of the data source.

The self-assessment and high potential survey (Guskin et al., 1986), which was confirmed by (Villatte and Leonardis, 2011), helps capture the nature of self-representation of the great power of the youth and analyze the implication of these two measures. It consists of:
- a series of 10 features for which the respondents have to decide whether they suit them or not;
- a series of 30 characteristics for which the respondents have to declare whether they coincide with the ingenious young people in the educational field or in the artistic context.

For each feature, the possible answers are distributed over a four-point Liquert scale ranging from "do not agree at all "to "strongly agree". This survey shows the advantage of examining the content seen as particularly specific to the HP teenage population ("ingenious", "intelligent", etc.) as well as the specific features that represent the intellectual and / or artistic HP youngster image ("sir / madam, I know everything," "I like the challenges, etc.) , which is not the case for SDQII.

IV. RESULTS OBTAINED TROUGH THE G.P.S. TECHNOLOGY

To analyze the contents of the acquired data, an adaptation of the grid proposed by L'Ecuyer (1990) was designed. Once the distribution was achieved, we assessed, on the one hand, the number of subjects who invoked at least one statement included in these categories and, on the other hand, the number of statements mentioned by the subjects in each class. In this case, every possibility was taken into account, especially when students incorporated similar contents by assuming that these repetitions transpose a typical value of the considered measurement.

4.1. The analysis of the different responses to the question "who am I?
Table 2 displays the categories which include all the statements referred to by the teenagers in response to the question "Who am I?".

Table 2: Elements discussed while responding to the first question according to the subjects' sex

Dimensions	Total % students	Boys % students	Girls % students	Probability Chi 2 test	Total % appearance	Boys % appearance	Girls % appearance
Status	71	73	64	0.562	8.3	10.5	8.7
Living conditions	36	21	56	<.001	2.4	1.6	3.2
Activities	41	60	40	0.963	5.1	4.7	4.5
Tastes / Disinterests	61	56	61	0.738	12.1	12.7	11.3
Ideology	58	41	72	<.001	6.1	5.7	5.8
Aspirations	43	36	61	.013	5.1	5.9	4.8
Self-activities	81	79	94	0.621	11.1	12.7	10.1
Academic/intellectual self	63	58	77	0.336	7.1	7.3	6.3
Moral self	19	16	18	0.685	0.9	0.7	0.5
physical self	38	33	47	0.287	3.8	3.2	3.9
Emotional self	69	52	96	<.001	9.5	6.3	11.8
Social self	80	73	96	.001	22.4	21.6	22.7
Artistic self	15	14	16	0.235	0.8	0.7	0.9
Global self	77	65	79	.050	11.6	9.4	10.9

Source: Authors' estimation of the data source.

More girls than boys indicated at least one argument about their social conditions, their appropriate positions or their ambitions (it is worth mentioning that girls have given fewer arguments than boys on the last point). Moreover, girls more than often elicit an argument reflecting an assessment and/or a self-esteem definition related to the emotional, social, and general levels. Unlike girls, very few boys presented at least one argument regarding their social status, inclination, personal activities and self-evaluation at the intellectual and academic levels.

The number of people who mentioned at least one argument concerning the carried out activities, the moral, physical, or artistic environments as well as the number of arguments related to each of these measures does not help perceive our two samples. Therefore, we decided to focus on the measures where the sex difference is more important.

It should be noted first that boys emphasize their HIP teenager status. Moreover, they disclose more arguments that contain ambiguous existential criteria (e.g.: "I am myself") (41% of the boys cited at least one argument against 29% percent of the girls).

Regarding the activities that the interviewees affirmed they have conducted, while boys are more likely to mention a sporting activity (31% of boys compared to 17% of girls) girls favour intellectual and recreational activities (25% of girls against 11% of boys). In addition, girls reported carrying out more school-related tasks (e.g. writing articles) (19% of girls versus 8% of boys).

Concerning the statements that reflect a lack of interest, only boys talked about intellectual leisure and literary academic topics whereas girls said they did not like scientific subjects. Regarding "self-activities", girls said they are making more efforts than boys to get along with their classmates and keep better relations with them (35% of girls against 21% of boys) especially by hiding their differences and their HP adolescents' status. Moreover, many girls reported they were in conformity with the educational institutions requirements (23% of the girls against 17% of the boys).

Furthermore, girls brought a lot of arguments that reflect a higher degree of independence (40% of girls reported at least one argument, against 13% of boys, with 1.7% of total occurrences against 0.6% for boys). This can be explained by their persistence and efforts to prepare their future and their objectives, obtain their financial and psychological independence, solve their problems and develop their own potential.

For the intellectual and academic self-esteem, only girls affirmed they were scientifically incompetent (13% among them mentioned at least one element). However, more girls mentioned skills in humanities (13% against 3% of boys) but none of them spoke about incompetence in this sphere, compared to 2% of the boys who did so. In fact, girls are almost twice as many as boys to present arguments on their physical appearance (39% of the girls against 17% of the boys; 3.4% of occurrences against 2.1% for the boys (in a positive, negative or neutral way).

On the other hand, twice as many girls as boys are to state to be sensitive and emotional (42% against 21% of boys) and made at least one statement relative to the different emotional and sentimental arguments (82% compared to 39% of boys). In fact, they often mentioned arguments reflecting a general emotional

situation ("I am happy"), and having a positive or negative sign (63% of girls compared to 11% of boys; with 3.2% of the total occurrences for girls against 0.7% for the boys).

Considering the future-related feelings, girls showed no positive argument but they are more likely than boys to bring negative arguments (12% compared to 4% for boys) (e.g.: I'm concerned about my future). Social self-assessment primarily includes the ideas that individuals have about themselves and are assigned to the opinions of others. Only girls revoked positive beliefs about social skills (10% of girls). Conversely, more boys gave at least one positive opinion about intellectual capacities. Girls also mentioned a few more arguments that reflect a lack of social skills (51% of girls compared to 36% of boys; 3.3% against 1.4 % of the occurrences)

Regarding the friendly atmosphere, more girls than boys mentioned their classmates (29% compared to 19% of boys) and positively evaluated them (22% compared to 7% of boys). Besides, girls who expressed at least an argument about their relationship with their classmates are more numerous than boys (75% of the girls compared to 50% for boys). Indeed, 49% of these girls against 37% of boys believe this relationship is harmonious.

For the family atmosphere, more girls than boys talked about the members of their families (41% against 21% of boys) and regularly assessed them positively (22% against 14% of boys). Moreover, there are more girls who expressed at least an argument about their relations with other families (35% versus 25% of boys).

Finally, more girls than boys reported an evaluative expression on their personality, whether positive or negative (48% against 18% of boys; 2.9% of events against 1.02% of boys). They often say they have a different personality from their classmates, especially in their development (23% of girls against 8% of boys). The general perception of difference in compliance ("I am different") with respect to their classmates is more frequently stated by girls, although these statements are less common among girls than boys.

4.2. Analysis of the second step answers given: "What is most important in self-description?"
The measures used to identify the differences between sexes, such as the social status, the personal activities, and the physical appearance, were frequently cited by boys more than girls. Therefore, it should be noted that boys are the only ones who consider that a high potential is a key element of their character.

Table 3: Evoked arguments in relation to the second question answer

Dimensions	Total % students	Boys % students	Girls % students	Total % occurrences	Boys % occurrences	Girls % occurrences
All	1	1	2	0.5	0.2	1.2
Statuses	12	14	6	3.2	5.1	1.2
Living conditions	4	1	6	1.7	0.1	3.3
Tastes	19	18	17	12.4	15.5	10.1
Ideology	25	14	28	14.5	14.3	14.8
Aspirations	15	9	21	9.6	6.2	13.2
Self-activities	19	22	14	8.9	9.9	7.2
Academic and intellectual activities	15	16	14	7.7	7.2	8.3
Physical self	9	11	6	3.4	4.8	1.8
Emotinal self	21	14	25	8.2	4.9	9.3
social self	33	32	31	18.6	18.7	18.5
Global self	32	31	33	12.8	14.2	12.3

Source: Authors' estimation of the data source.

Regarding the personal activity category, boys outnumber girls (17% of boys against 7% of girls) in listing the methods they have adopted to keep an acceptable self-evaluation and avoid questions (I created ideas to be loved, "sports help me in my escape"). Moreover, boys often refer to the independence that they would like to keep in their relation with their classmates so that they would not be forced to change their behavior (12% of boys compared to 4% of girls). On the other hand, 9% of girls against 3% of boys mentioned examples related to their failure in getting updated while facing the obstacles they come across in the achievement of their potential and/or their self-assertion.

Unlike what we might have expected, only boys spoke about their physical appearance (using neutral, positive or negative expressions) while girls are much more obvious than boys on the terms related to their physical abilities. However, it should be noted that only boys showed their interest in physical activities. Once again, 13% of girls against no boys showed their sentimentality, their feeling as well as their current emotional state (21% of girls against 10% of boys).

When dealing with the social environment, 6% of boys against 3.1% of girls gave more examples related to a friendly environment reflecting, among other things, their insensitivity to their classmates. However, a great number of girls spoke about the family environment (20% against 9% of boys; 8.2% of occurrences against 4% of boys). Ultimately, the boys in our sample outnumber the girls in not only reporting that their difference is part of their identity (17% against 7% of girls, 41% of events for girls) but also in showing their self-confidence (14% against 2.5% of boys, 4.1% of occurrences against 1.2% for boys.

4.3. Results obtained by means of the SDQII questionnaire
The only measures that significantly reflect differences between girls and boys are related to their physical skills (evaluation of activities) and emotional equilibrium. In fact, boys feel more experienced and/or more attracted by sports exercises; however, they presume they tend to be quiet, calm and unworried.

Table 4: Average normalized results obtained on each of the SDQII elements

Factors	Total (n=100)	Boys (n=55)	Girls (n=45)	t-Test	P-value
Mathematics	2.57	2.59	2.40	0.45	0.65
Verbal	2.71	2.63	2.32	1.65	0.10
Academic/ general	2.96	2.85	3.10	1.44	0.15
Honesty	3.02	2.83	3.03	1.23	0.22
Physical abilities	2.85	2.69	2.41	2.33	0.022
Physical appearance	2.66	2.62	2.72	0.63	0.53
Emotional stability	2.13	2.15	2.85	2.96	0.004
Relationship with parents	3.33	3.26	3.13	0.88	0.38
Relationship with the pairs of the same sex	3.02	3.52	3.17	0.78	0.44
Relationship with the pairs of different sex	2.92	2.23	2.53	0.43	0.67
Global	2.96	3.02	3.52	1.23	0.22

Source: Authors' estimation of the data source.

4.4. The results obtained through a questionnaire about self-evaluation and high potential
The only important difference in this first series of characteristics refers to the item "someone special" that the boys have chosen. The term "gifted" is also very much used by boys (the difference is simultaneously significant).

Table 5: Rate of people who have a completely approved of Guskin et al. (1986) questionnaire

Characteristics	Boys (n = 55)		Girls (n = 45)		Chi 2 test
	Rather agree %	Completely agree%	Rather agree %	Completely agree%	
Brilliant	45.2	13.6	39.7	6.8	0.362
In the average	37.5	21.3	55.3	14.9	0.523
Successful	52.6	20.3	56.2	23.4	0.654
Talented	59.6	15.2	47.3	5.6	0.030
A good student	49.7	15.3	53.4	25.1	0.961
Clever	56.2	19.5	56.7	17.2	0.369
Good in the artistic field	30.1	25.6	19.4	30.1	0.452
Talented	65.2	22.3	58.6	11.3	0.251
Intelligent	61.3	32.5	65.3	19.8	0.113
Creative	14.3	31.2	37.6	22.5	0.635
Imaginative	37.5	40.3	39.6	33.4	0.457
Someone special	30.2	57.6	47.6	31.0	0.0320

Source: Authors' estimation of the data source.

The items on which boys showed significantly better scores than girls are: interesting, is not interested in school, good at sports, born with a talent. Conversely, the scores on the emotional and affectionate items for girls are significantly higher than those for boys.

High potential girls significantly evaluate themselves in a more positive way than boys, not in terms of their performance at school but rather in terms of their behavior generally assigned to "good students" (friendly with the teacher and interested in school). However, boys positively appreciate their capacities, their authentic

talent, their expertise, their sporting talents and emotional equilibrium. Moreover, they insist much more on their singularity.

Table 6: Rate of the respondents who fully or partially agree on the following 30 items of Guskin et al. (1986) questionnaire

Characteristics	Boys (n = 55)		Girls (n = 45)		Chi 2 test
	Rather agree %	Completely agree%	Rather agree %	Completely agree%	
The darling of the teachers	16.3	3.6	19.8	6.7	0.365
Interesting	56.3	31.2	90.1	8.7	0.021
Full of life	41.3	35.6	33.3	48.2	0.561
Not interested in the school	26.5	22.4	14.7	3.9	0.023
Makes friends easily	56.3	19.0	46.2	17.9	0.384
Good at sports	45.6	20.2	33.4	11.2	0.012
Passionate	35.2	36.4	41.2	39.5	0.654
Pretentious	25.2	5.8	14.7	3.1	0.879
Born with a talent	46.3	21.6	39.6	6.1	0.021
Feel comfortable	61.2	13.5	50.8	22.5	0.258
Doe not get along with	11.2	5.2	9.1	6.3	0.985
Try to draw the attention	41.3	5.1	30.2	3.1	0.215
Confident	41.2	11.5	23.6	9.7	0.569
Has a competitive spirit	35.1	22.2	44.9	11.2	0.354
Well dressed	70.1	9.1	72.6	22.5	0.554
Sir/Madam, I know everything	15.3	9.1	30.1	1.2	0.147
A leader	35.1	15.2	34.6	3.5	0.258
Easily jealous of others	26.1	15.1	31.8	6.1	0.326
Sensitive	33.9	43.5	28.6	70.1	0.016
Always has good marks	41.3	5.2	39.8	12.8	0.158
Hang out with a group	37.2	22.6	42.3	30.1	0.695
Popular	37.1	8.6	36.9	3.1	0.523
Immature	22.1	7.1	10.6	1.0	0.485
Different	43.5	36.2	49.7	25.2	0.365
Learns well alone	35.1	35.6	34.9	36.8	0.241
Likes the challenges	39.6	37.9	28.1	42.1	0.369
Studies all the time	12.6	3.2	28.9	6.1	0.247
Emotional	29.6	23.6	36.2	50.1	0.013
Has a difficulty in going out with boys/girls	35.6	18.1	31.6	22.5	0.324
Boring for teachers	28.2	11.1	22.5	0.7	0.052

Source: Authors' estimation of the data source.

V. CONCLUSION AND DISCUSSION

This research major objective was to understand the distinguished self-concept of HIP boys and girls who attend heterogeneous classes.

The social standard is an essential dimension of HIP teenagers' self-concept. Their relationship with others, whether harmonious or hostile, originates in the family, and friendly environments and the sources of pleasure or repulsion. This relationship is very frequently referred to by these teenagers. The results obtained on the SDQII questionnaire basis showed that boys and girls evaluate their social self-esteem in a close way, taking into account their skills, the social relationships quality and the interest allocated to them. If these dimensions were considered separately, it would seem that girls assess the quality of their social relationships in a more positive way (friends and family) and underline the interest they acquired from them. But they consider themselves as "less competent from a social point of view" than their classmates while confessing that they thought they were more competent. These results are in agreement with those of Ninot et al. (2000). Moreover, the importance they attributed to their social relations and their most important expectations in this field probably help explain these results. The efforts they claimed they made to get adapted to their friends (including the fact of concealing their differences) clearly reflect such importance.

Boys and girls measure students' performance thoroughly. Yet, if girls tend to positively asses themselves in the literary field, boys prefer scientific subjects. Compared to the considerable boys' poor

academic performance, these results are striking and appear consistent with those obtained by Ablard (1997) and Worrell et al. (1998).

These disparities in the students' performance help find explanatory elements in the teenagers jargon. In fact, boys deny having the essential characteristics of "a good student" (application, work, appropriate behavior towards the teaching staff) while girls regularly show the efforts they make to meet the regulatory aspirations and the importance they attribute to this compliance. After all, it is worth reminding that girls reported that they were more mobilized on school activities.

In addition to their self-esteem on the academic level, boys appear more confident in their intellectual capacities by declaring that they are first and foremost clever. The differentiated socialization at work in the Western societies, showing the boys' intelligence and the girls' compliance, certainly helps explain these distinctions.

The fact that the boys are more likely than girls to reveal to be distinguished with a typical status – that of an HP young teenager - reinforces the results obtained by Chan (2004) or Swiatek (2001). It will be more difficult for them to be in perfect harmony with their classmates and meet the school requirements as long as they themselves thrive for this adjustment.

Distinguished socialization also contributes to the explanation of the emotional interest in a very distinct way in the sample of girls; however, it does not seem to operate on the moral or artistic dimensions, where girls slightly tend to evaluate themselves more positively than boys.

The physical differences between boys and girls cannot be checked on all the tools. Actually, boys assess their skills and their interests in the sporting activities more positively, which makes these results in conformity with those of Cornell et al. (1990).

It is in this very context that the results show the way an individual in general assesses himself. Relying on the obtained results, it seems that boys tend to have a more overall self-esteem than girls, which seems to be in line with the results of Worrell et al. (1998). These results might be explained by the fact that our cultures attach more importance to the male gender, which induces boys to have more confidence in themselves and gain more power since their childhood.

The revealed differences join the results obtained on a sample of ordinary teenagers, where after a meta-analysis performed on 139 research studies available since 1980, Wilgenbusch and Merrell (1999) showed that girls have a more positive self-concept than boys regarding the verbal and social dimensions. On their part, boys positively assess their math skills, physical capacities and ability to manage anxiety. As an extension to this study, it is worth following the same steps on a control group comprising ordinary teenagers chosen on the basis of their gender, class, age, background, siblings, school and family situation in order to see if the same differences persist.

All the results achieved in this work go against a standardized and stereotypical representation of these teenagers. These young people are considered a relatively homogeneous population heading towards excellence, and academic and social success. The reality, however, seems to be more complicated and distinguished, especially in relation to the subject gender.

In fact, if HIP teenagers stand out intellectually, they cannot avoid some features of the differentiated socialization. Moreover, some authors state that the HIP subjects can be influenced through sex-based models proposed by the society, the media, the school and the parents due to their high awareness of the social tools (Silverman, 1993).

From a development point of view, it is worth analyzing the distinguished socialization impacts on the different adolescence phases (through a comparison carried out on teenagers between 13 and 15 and 18 and 19 years of age) to see if the gender differences do not represent a specific characteristic to a development period but a deeply rooted concept whatever its steps are.

REFERENCE

[1]. Ablard, K.E., 1997. Self-perceptions and needs as a function of type of academic ability and gender. *Roeper Review*, 20(2), 110-115.

[2]. Bain, S., and Bell, S.M., 2004. Social self-concept, social attributions and peer relationships in fourth, fifth and sixth grader who are gifted compared to high achievers. *Gifted child quarterly*, 48(3), 167-178.

[3]. Boschi, A., Planche P., Hemimou Ch., Demily C., and Vaivre-Douret L., 2016. From High Intellectual Potential to Asperger Syndrome: Evidence for Differences and a Fundamental Overlap-A Systematic Review. *Front Psychol*, 7(1605), 1-16, October.

[4]. Brian, Michael J., 2015. There Will Be Battles in the Heart of Your Abode The Threat Posed by Foreign Fighters Returning From Syria and Iraq Addendum. The RAND Corporation, April 17, 2015.

[5]. Byrne, B.M., 1996. Measuring self-concept across the life span: Issues and instrumentation. Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.

[6]. Chan, D.W., 2003. Dimensions on emotional intelligence and their relationships with social coping among gifted adolescents in Hong Kong. *Journal of youth and Adolescence*, 32(6), 409-418.

[7]. Chan, D.W., 2004. Social coping and psychological distress among Chinese gifted students in Hong Kong. *Gifted Child Quarterly*, 48, 30-41.

[8]. 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, 8-29.

[9]. Cornell, D.G., Pelton, G., Bassin, L., Landrum, M., and Ramsay, S., 1990. Self-concept and peer status of gifted program youth. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 82, 456-463.

[10]. Crain, M., and Bracken, B.A., 1994. Age, race and gender differences in child and adolescent self-concept: evidence from a behavioural-acquisition, context-dependent model. *School psychology review*, 23(3), 496-511.

[11]. Cross, T.L., Coleman, L.J., and Stewart, R.A., 1993. The social cognition of gifted adolescents: An exploration of the stigma of giftedness. *Roeper Review*, 16, 37-40.

[12]. Cunningham, G., and Rinn N., 2007. The role of gender and previous participation in a summer program on gifted adolescents' self-concepts over time. *Journal for the education of the gifted*, 30(3), 326-352.

[13]. Cxourtinat-Camps, Amélie, Villatte, Aude, Massé Line et De Léonardis Myriam, 2011. « Qui suis-je ? » : diversité des représentations de soi chez des adolescent(e)s à haut potentiel intellectuel. Bulletin de psychologie, 2011/4 (Numéro 514).

[14]. Dai, D.Y., 2001. A comparison of gender differences in academic self-concept and motivation between high-ability and average Chinese adolescents. *Journal of Secondary Gifted Education*, 13, 22-32.

[15]. Delaubier, J.P., 2002. La scolarisation des élèves "intellectuellement précoces". Rapport au Ministre de l'Education Nationale. Paris.

[16]. Dixon, F.A., Cross T.L., and Adams C.M. 2001. Psychological characteristics of academically gifted students in a residential setting: a cluster analysis. *Psychology in the schools*, 38(5), 433-445.

[17]. Erikson, E.H., 1980. Identity and the life cycle, New York, W.W. Norton.

[18]. Field, T., Harding, J., Yando, R., Gonzalez, K., Lasko, D., Bendell, D., and Marks, C. 1998. Feelings and attitudes of gifted students. *Adolescence*, 33(130), 331-342.

[19]. Gallagher, J.J., 2003. Issues and challenges in the education of gifted students. In N. Colangelo and G.A. Davis (Eds.), Handbook of Gifted Education (3rd ed.) (pp. 11-23). Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

[20]. Gottfried, A.E., and Gottfried, A.W., 2004. Toward the development of a conceptualization of gifted motivation. *Gifted Child Quarterly*, 48(1), 121-132.

[21]. Guskin, S.L., C. Okolo, E. Zimmerman, and C.Y.J. Peng, 1986. Being labeled gifted or talented: Meanings and effects perceived by students in special programs. *Gifted Chid Quarterly*, 30(2), 61-65.

[22]. Hentati, A., and Elloumi A., 2013. Tunisian validation of a measuring instrument: Physical Self-Description Questionnaire (PSDQ). *IOSR Journal Of Humanities And Social Science*, 11(1): 79-88.

[23]. Héroux, L., et Farrell, M., 1985. Le développement du concept de soi chez les enfants de 5 à 8 ans. Revue des sciences de l'éducation, 11(1), 103-117.

[24]. Hoge, R.D., and McSheffrey, R., 1991. An investigation of self-concept in gifted children. *Exceptional Children*, 57, 238-245.

[25]. Hoge, R.D., and Renzulli, J.S., 1993. Exploring the link between giftedness and self-concept. *Review of Educational Research,* 63(4), 449-465.

[26]. Jamieson, K.M., 2007. Over excitabilities: a new way to think about talent? (Patterns of over excitabilities). *Roeper Review*, 2, 14-18.

[27]. Kelly, K.R., and Jordan, L.K., 1990. Effects of academic achievement and gender on academic and social self-concept: A replication study. *Journal of Counseling and Development*, 69, 173-177.

[28]. King, K.C., Hyde, J.S., Showers, C.J., and Buswell, B.N., 1999. Gender differences in self-esteem: A meta-analysis. *Psychological Bulletin*, 125, 470-500.

[29]. Kroger, J., 2003. What transits in an identity status transition? *An International Journal of Theory and Research*, 3(3), 197-220.

[30]. L'Écuyer, R., 1978. Le concept de soi. Paris : *Presses Universitaires de France*.

[31]. L'Écuyer, R., 1990. Méthodologie de l'analyse développementale de contenu : Méthode GPS et concept de soi. Sillery, Québec : *Presses de l'Université du Québec*.

[32]. Lea-Wood, S.S., and Clunies-Ross. G., 1995. Self-esteem of gifted adolescent girls in Australian schools, Roeper review, 17(3), 195-197.

[33]. Lewis, Joan D., and, Knight Harold V., 2000. Self-concept in gifted youth: an investigation employing the Piers Harris subscales. *Gifted child quarterly*, 44, 45-53.

[34]. Manaster, G.J., and Powell, P.M. 1983. A framework for understanding gifted adolescents' psychological maladjustment. *Roeper Review*, 6, 70-73.

[35]. Markus, H., and Wurf, E., 1987. The dynamic self concept: A social psychological perspective. *Annual*

review of psychology, 38, 299-337.

[36]. Marsh, H.W, and O'Mara A., 2008. Reciprocal effects between academic self-concept, self-esteem, achievement and attainment over seven adolescent years: unidimensional and multidimensional perspectives of self-concept, Personality and social psychology bulletin, 34, 542-552.

[37]. Marsh, H.W., 1990. A multidimensional, hierarchical model of self concept theoretical and empirical justification. *Educational psychology review*, 2(2), 77-172.

[38]. Massé, L., and Gagné, F., 2001. Adaptation socio-affective des élèves doués et relations avec les pairs. *Revue Canadienne de Psychoéducation*, 30(1), 15-37.

[39]. McCoach, D.B., and Siegle, D., 2003. The structure and function of academic self-concept in gifted and general education students. *Roeper Review*, 25(2), 61-65.

[40]. Moon, S.M., 2004. Social and emotional issues, underachievement and counseling. Thousand Oaks, CA, U.S: Corwin Press.

[41]. Neihart, M., 1999. The impact of giftedness on psychological well-being: What does the empirical literature say? *Roeper Review*, 24, 10-17.

[42]. Ninot, G., Bilard, J., Delignieres, D., and Sololowski, M., 2000. Overestimation of perceived competence in adolescents placed in specialized schools. *European Review of Applied Psychology*, 50, 165-174.

[43]. Norman, A.D., Ramsay, S.G., Martray, C.R., and Roberts, J.L., 1999. Relationship between levels of giftedness and psychosocial adjustment. *Roeper Review*, 22, 5-10.

[44]. Pereira-Fradin, Maria, 2006. Les différences individuelles chez les enfants à haut potentiel, dans Lubart T., Enfants exceptionnels : précocité intellectuelle, haut potentiel et talent, Paris, Bréal, p. 36-64.

[45]. Perrone, K., Perrone, Ph., Ksiazak, T., Wright, S., and Jackson, Z., 2007. Self-Perception of Gifts and Talents among Adults in a Longitudinal Study of Academically Talented High-School Graduates. *Roeper Review*, 29(4), 259-264.

[46]. Pyryt, M.C., and Mendaglio, S., 1994. The multidimensional self-concept: A comparison of gifted and average-ability adolescents. *Journal for the Education of the Gifted*, 17, 299-305.

[47]. Reis, S., 2002. Internal barriers, personal issues and decisions faced by gifted and talented girls and women. *Gifted child today*, 25(1), 14-28.

[48]. Reis, S.M., and Renzulli, J.S., 2004. Current research on the social and emotional development of gifted and talented students: Good news and future possibilities. *Psychology in the schools*, 1(41), 119-130.

[49]. Rinn, A.N., 2006. Effects of a summer program on the social self-concepts of gifted adolescents. *Journal of Secondary Gifted Education*, 17, 65-75.

[50]. Rinn, A.N., and Cunningham L.G., 2008. Using self-concept instruments with high-ability college students: reliability and validity evidence. *Gifted child quarterly*, 102(3), 232-242.

[51]. Rinn, A.N., Jamieson. K., Gross. C., and McQueen. K., 2009. A canonical correlation analysis of the influence of social comparison, gender and grade level on the multidimensional self-concepts of gifted adolescents. *Social psychology of education*, 12(2), 251-269.

[52]. Rudasill, K.M., 2009. Grade and gender differences in gifted students' self-concepts, *Journal for the education of the gifted*, 32(3), 340-367.

[53]. Shavelson, R.J., Hubner, J.J., and Stanton, G.C., 1976. Self-concept: Validation of construct interpretations. *Review of Educational Research*, 46, 407-441.

[54]. Silverman, L.K., (1993). Social development, leadership and gender. In L.K. Silverman (Ed.), Counseling the gifted and talented (pp. 291-327). Denver: Love.

[55]. Stipeck, D.J., and MacIver, D., 1989. Developmental change in children's assessment of intellectual competence. *Child Development*, 60, 521-538.

[56]. Swann W.B., J.R., Chang-Schneider C., and Larsen McClarty K., 2007. Do people's self-views matter? Self-concept and self-esteem in everyday life. *American Psychologist*, 112, 84-94.

[57]. Swiatek, M.A., 1995. An empirical investigation of the social coping strategies used by gifted adolescents. *Gifted Child Quarterly*, 39(3), 154-161.

[58]. Swiatek, M.A., 2001. Social coping among gifted high school students and its relationship to self-concept. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence*, 30(1), 19-39.

[59]. Swiatek, M.A., 2002. Social coping among gifted elementary students. *Journal for the Education of the Gifted,* 26, 65-86.

[60]. Tong, J., and Yewchuk, C., 1996. Self concept and sex-role orientation in gifted high school students. *Gifted Child Quarterly*, 40(1), 15-23.

[61]. Van Tassel-Baska, J., Olszewski-Kubilius, P., and Kulieke M., 1994. A study of self-concept and social support in advantaged and disadvantaged seventh and eighth grade gifted students, *Roeper review*, 16(3), 186-191.

[62]. Villatte, A., and de Léonardis, M., 2011. Les représentations de soi et du talent scolaire et artistique chez des lycéens à haut potentiel et tout-venant. *Les Cahiers Internationaux de Psychologie Sociale*, 2011/1

(Numéro 89-90), 63-86.

[63]. Wilgenbusch, T., and Merrell, K.W., 1999. Gender Differences in Self-concept among Children and Adolescents: a Meta-analysis of Multidimentional Studies. *School Psychology Quaterly*, 14 (2), 101-120.

[64]. Winner, E., 2000. Giftedness: Current theory and research. *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, 9, 153–156.

[65]. Worrell, F.C., Roth, D.A., and Gabelko, N.H., 1998. Age and gender differences in the self-concepts of academically talented students. *Journal of Secondary Gifted Education*, 9, 157-162.

[66]. Yan, K., and Haihui, Z. 2005. A decade comparison: self-concept of gifted and non-gifted adolescents. *International Education Journal*, 6(2), 224-231.