Global Journal of Guidance and Counseling in Schools: Current Perspectives

Volume 10, Issue 2, (2020) 64-78

www.gjgc.eu

Human values and psychological well-being of gifted/talented students and their peers with average development

Adnan Ozbey* Dumlupinar University, Turkey

Suggested Citation:

Ozbey, A (2020). Human values and psychological well-being of gifted/talented students and their peers with average development. *Global Journal of Guidance and Counselling in Schools: Current Perspectives. 10*(2), 64-78. https://doi.org/10.18844/gjgc.v10i2.4656

Received from April 20, 2020; revised from July 20, 2020; accepted from August, 12, 2020.
Selection and peer review under responsibility of Prof. Dr. Kobus Maree, University of Pretoria South Africa.

Abstract

The main objective of this study is to compare the human values and psychological well-being of gifted/talented students with their peers with standard development. In addition, it aims to determine the level of relationship between human values and psychological well-being of gifted/talented students and whether human values were effective on psychological well-being. In this research, the relational survey model of quantitative research methods, which is a sub-type of the general survey model, is used. Assistance was received from 328 (59.3%) eighth-grade secondary school students in schools run by the Ministry of National Education in Izmir and Manisa and 225 (40.7%) gifted/talented students who were educated at BILSEM. To collect data, the Human Values Scale (PSI) and the Psychological Well-being Scale were used. Independent samples *t*-test for paired comparisons, Pearson's product-moment correlation analysis for variable relationships and regression analysis to determine the predictive level were used. According to the *t*-test results, the human values and psychological well-being levels of gifted/talented students were higher than those of their peers with standard development and the gender variable did not play an effective role in the psychological well-being of gifted/talented students. As a result of the correlation analysis, a statistically significant correlation was found between human values and the psychological well-being of gifted/talented students. According to the regression analysis, human values significantly increased psychological well-being.

Keywords: Giftedness/talent, human values, psychological well-being.

* ADDRESS FOR CORRESPONDENCE: **Adnan Ozbey,** Dumlupinar University, Andız, DPÜ Evliya Çelebi Yerleşkesi, Kütahya Tavşanlı Yolu 10. km, 43100 Kütahya Merkez/Kütahya, Turkey
E-mail address: adnanozbey@hotmail.com

1. Introduction

People have always given thought to the question of 'what makes life valuable and how can a valuable life be built?' For many people, a good life is often regarded as the highest value for which tolerance, respect, helpfulness, etc. can be combined. In some ethical systems, especially usefulness and goodness are seen as the highest benefits and these actions add value to life depending on the general welfare level they create. Senses of happiness and development are among the states that show life is going well. In this context, criteria such as loving/benefiting others, enjoying life and self-understanding, as the defining characteristics of quality of life, have been focused on (Diener, 2000; Seligman, 2010). Current studies on a good life have taken the form of targeting the development of interventions that preserve mental health, eliminate adjustment disorders and improve living conditions by concentrating on the innate strengths of individuals (Seligman & Csikszentmihalyi, 2000).

Well-being is a concept that reflects a versatile, balanced and comprehensive life structure. It involves being healthy and successful in social, physical, mental, emotional, professional and spiritual fields (Akhter, 2015). The concept of well-being has been tried to be explained from two different perspectives. The one with subjective well-being (hedonic) that aims to reach pleasure and escape from pain focuses on happiness and expresses a mental and emotional assessment of one's life. In other words, it involves reaching the conclusion that the individual receives satisfaction from all areas of life with cognitive judgments and feels positive emotions that give him happiness in life more intensely than negative ones (Deiner, Lucas & Oishi, 2002). Psychological well-being (Eudaimonic) focuses on the level and meaning of life, human potential and self-realisation (Keyes, Shmotkin & Ryff, 2002; Ryan & Deci, 2001). It focuses on people achieving their objectives, developing their potentials, quality of relationships and sense of responsibility, and constructing life on their ability to deal with difficulties (Siqueira & Padovam, 2008).

Psychological well-being refers to the state of 'living a full and deeply satisfying life' (Deci &Ryan, 2008). While Edwards, Ngcobo, Edwards and Palavar (2005) define well-being as mental health, Ward (2008) defines it as psychological, emotional and physical health. According to Huppert's (2009) study, psychological well-being is related to life going well and it is a combination of feeling good and working effectively. It is the result of individuals' assessment of their capacities, family, environmental conditions, income and quality of life based on their personal criteria combined with the values and expectations of society. The best-known indicator is life satisfaction (Eggleston et al., 2001; Ordonez, Lima-Silva & Cachioni, 2011). It can be considered as one of the outcomes of self-actualisation and psychological functioning as a result of adequate functioning of a system of adaptive and harmonious objectives as well as autonomy, competence and commitment (Ryan & Deci, 2000). When this conception is not/cannot be reached, hopelessness, lack of control over one's life and lack of vital goals occur with a negative cognitive-motivational state (Garcia-Alandete, 2015). Psychological well-being is more likely to occur in people who experience less negative feelings, such as sadness and anger, who are in a positive mood and who are at peace with themselves and their surroundings (Fierro, 2006).

The level of psychological well-being is influenced by subjective experiences and physical, mental and social factors and changes (Hidalgo et al., 2010; Tay& Kuykendall, 2013). Social factors comprise family, school, work, belief, values and all social systems that affect individuals (Kumar, 2014). Culture and values are accepted as the main factors that affect psychological well-being (Brown & Kasser, 2005; Grossi, Blessi, Sacco & Buscema, 2012). Indeed, some research results have shown that social integration and values have a significant effect on the individual's psychological well-being (Lu & Shih, 1997; Lu, Gilmour &Kao, 2001).

According to Davidov, Schmidt and Schwartz's (2008) study, values are abstract motivations that direct, explain or justify attitudes, norms, thoughts and actions. According to this definition, values are not temporary choices, but rather they show that the individual's personality and behaviour have

steady dimensions, deep and perdurable beliefs (Parks & Guay, 2009; Thompson, 1981). The concept of value does not refer to what has happened/been, but what should happen/be. Therefore, a value should have a meaning for action and ideal (Akyuz, 2014). In this respect, values also show the importance that an individual attaches to life (Onder & Bulut, 2013). On one hand, they constitute the cause of human actions and on the other hand, they form part of their identity (Parks-Leduc, Feldman & Bardi, 2015). Value is an essential element for an individual to be/able to be a person; It is a characteristic of personality as a conscious experience (Gokalp, 2014). The values, attitudes and behaviours that are closely related to the quest for spiritual and mental balance, desire to understand/make sense of life and need for social acceptance provide an opportunity to evaluate not only individuals but also social groups and cultures in a healthy way by allowing them to understand/anticipate attitudes and behaviours in advance (Myyrya, Juujarvi & Pesso, 2010; Ozcan & Erol, 2017). In recognising right and wrong through cultural reconciliation, concerning whether the decisions taken by the individual are socially shared and considered important (Ulavere & Veisson, 2015), values that guide human life (Rennie, 2007; Schwartz, 1992) provide a place in the social structure through social consciousness.

Studies on values and psychological well-being, where individuals and/or groups have better/higher levels of psychological well-being and where personality traits affect values and psychological well-being, are among the studies where attention is concentrated. In particular, the search for the relationship between intelligence and well-being has a long history (Wigtil & Henriques, 2015). Some researchers have suggested that gifted/talented individuals may be happier than their peers with average development due to their capacity to achieve their goals better/more easily (Diener & Fujita, 1995). Han and Kim (2008) stated that students who are successful in different scientific fields and who are better in terms of academic performance have higher levels of optimism, psychological well-being and happiness than their peers. However, there are also researchers arguing that gifted/talented individuals have a higher risk of having problems concerning their social and emotional development than their peers who show average development, and therefore their life satisfaction will be low (Daniels & Piechowski, 2009; Robinson, 2008; Ziegler & Raul, 2000).

Ozbey (2016) pointed out three factors in the social and emotional development of gifted/talented students. First of all, highly talented people should demonstrate their academic potential and experience satisfaction in this field. Academic capacity/satisfaction gives self-confidence and self-respect to gifted/talented students, and as a result, highly talented students become socially and emotionally successful. The second factor is the educational institution/teachers and the family circle. Educators who fully understand the learning characteristics and complexity of gifted/talented children and parents of gifted children can give them the sense of trust they need in their social relationships (Riley, Sampson, White, Ward man & Walker, 2015; Silverman, 2003). Gifted children, like all children, learn in a social environment and their social/emotional well-being depends on the attitude and understanding of those around them. Teachers' attitudes, perceptions and practices in the learning environment affect the self-perception of gifted children (Delaune & Tapper, 2015). The third factor is the circle of friends. Gifted/talented children tend to be friends with people who are suitable for their cognitive development rather than their chronological age. These children seek not only intellectual compliance but also a similar understanding, close and trust-based friendship and relationships (Gross, 2006). Therefore, making friends with individuals suitable for their social and emotional development may positively affect the psychological well-being of gifted/talented students.

1.1. Significance of the research

Even though children with average development have limited awareness of what is happening during their class time, gifted students can comprehend the complexities and problems in the world (McGee & Hughes, 2011; Roeper & Silverman, 2009). Although the academic intelligence of gifted/talented students is significantly higher than their peers, their social and emotional aspects may not be developed at the same level. It is accepted that educational environments, friendship and

inadequate family circle which do not respond to the learning and thinking speed and level of gifted/talented students play an effective role in this (Reis & Renzulli, 2004). Because of the mismatch between mental intelligence and social and emotional development, gifted students are likely to face social or emotional problems that other peers will not have to endure (Silverman, 2003). This may cause them to be deprived of a meaningful and satisfying social life (Gere, Capps, Mitchell &Grubbs, 2009).

Current educational systems primarily aim at the cognitive development of students and focus on providing necessary knowledge and competencies in academic terms. This approach neglects gifted/talented students' development and their training for social and emotional skills (Van der Zee, Thijs & Schakel, 2002). However, research and expert opinions emphasise that gifted/talented students have more emotional needs than cognitive needs (Al-Adwan & Al-Khayat, 2015). A good life for gifted/talented individuals is not only about developing their intelligence (Ogurlu et al., 2016). Especially in the 21st century, it is imperative to have all the skills necessary to succeed in complex problems and tougher living conditions. Advanced cognitive ability cannot be expected to compensate for social and emotional skill deficiencies (Whetten & Cameron, 2007). Therefore, students' social and emotional development should be taken into consideration as well as their mental development (Corso, 2007).

It is accepted that there is a relationship between an individual's values and psychological well-being (Schwartz & Sortheix, 2018; Sortheix, 2014). Although there are studies describing the relationship between these two structures, no study explaining the relationship between human values and psychological well-being in gifted/talented individuals has been found. Methodological studies are needed in this context.

The main objective of this study is to compare the human values and psychological well-being of gifted/talented students with standard developing students. Also, it aims to determine the level of relationship between human values and psychological well-being in gifted/talented students and whether human values are effective on psychological well-being. Some studies in the related field (Ozbey & Saricam, 2016; Ozbey, 2016; Tirri & Pehkonen, 1998; Winner, 1997) found that gifted students had higher levels of values than their peers. In this study, taking the positive relationship between values and psychological well-being (Schwartz & Sortheix, 2018; Sortheix, 2014) and the capacities of gifted individuals into consideration, it has been thought that gifted/talented individuals would have higher scores in terms of psychological well-being. For this purpose, the following hypotheses were tested:

H1. The level of human values of gifted/talented students will be statistically significantly higher than that of their peers with average development.

H2. Psychological well-being of gifted/talented students will be statistically significantly higher than that of their peers with average development.

H3. The level of psychological well-being of gifted/talented male students will be statistically significantly higher than that of gifted/talented female students.

H4. There is a statistically significant correlation between the level of human values and psychological well-being of gifted/talented students.

H5. The level of human values of gifted/talented students statistically significantly predicts their level of psychological well-being.

2. Method

In this research, the relational survey model of quantitative research methods, which is a sub-type of the general survey model, was used. General survey models are surveying arrangements made on a whole population with many elements, or a group, a sample or sampling, to be taken from the

population to make a general judgment about the population. Single or relational surveys can be carried out with general survey models. The relational survey model is a research model that aims to determine the presence and/or degree of interchange between two and more variables (Punch, 2009, 2013). In this study, it is aimed to determine whether there is a difference between gifted/talented students and students with average development in terms of human values and level of psychological well-being, to determine the possible relationship between human values and psychological well-being and whether human values increase psychological well-being.

2.1. Study group

An appropriate sampling method was chosen to collect data. An appropriate sampling method was selected from easily accessible and practicable units to prevent loss of time, money and labor (Buy ukozturket al., 2015). Assistance for this purpose was received from 328 (59.3%) eighth-grade secondary school students in schools run by the Ministry of National Education in Izmir and Manisa and 225 (40.7%) gifted/talented students who were educated at BILSEM in the academic year 2015–2016. In the first stage, the scales were evaluated separately and 11 students whose scales were missing or incorrect were excluded from the sample. As a result, a total of 553 secondary school students were selected for the study group, with 225 (40.7%) gifted/talented and 328 (59.3%) average students. The gifted/talented students with an IQ of 130 and higher IQ were registered to BILSEM, while average students attended public schools. 289 (52.3%) of the students were female and 264 (47.7%) were male. Their ages ranged from 13 to 15 years, with an average age of 13.66 years.

2.2. Data collection tools

2.2.1. Human values scale (ISS)

The scale was developed by Dilmac (2007) to determine the human values of adolescents. It is a 5-point Likert-type scale consisting of 42 items in six dimensions (1 = Never, 2 = Rarely, 3 = Occasionally, 4 = Frequently, 5 = Always). Increasing scores of the scale indicate that individuals have higher levels of human values. The internal consistency coefficients of the scale (Cronbach's alpha) were 0.73 for the 'Responsibility' subscale, 0.69 for the 'Friendship' subscale, 0.65 for the 'Peacefulness' subscale, 0.67 for the 'Respect' subscale, 0.69 for the 'Honesty' subscale, 0.70 for the 'Tolerance' subscale and the internal consistency coefficient for the whole scale of 42 items was found as alpha 0.92. The stability coefficients of the scale were 0.73 for 'Responsibility', 0.91 for 'Friendship',0.80 for 'Peacefulness', 0.88 for 'Respect', 0.75 for 'Honesty' and 0.79 for 'Tolerance'. The stability coefficient for the whole scale was 0.87. For this study, Cronbach's alpha internal consistency coefficient was calculated as 0.86 for the whole scale. The sub-dimensions were calculated as 0.68 for 'Responsibility', 0.71 for 'Friendship', 0.67 for 'Peacefulness', 0.73 for 'Respect', 0.68 'Honesty' and 0.69 for 'Tolerance'. Some of the items in the Human Values Scale were '1. I take responsibility for what I do'; '8. I attach great importance to friendship'; '17. I don't expect anything to help people'; '22. I can accept everyone's opinion'; and '36. I forgive every mistake made against me'.

2.2.2. Psychological well-being scale

The Psychological Well-being Scale, complementary to existing well-being measures, was developed by Diener et al. (2009–2010) to measure socio-psychological well-being. The scale was adapted to Turkish by Telef (2011, 2013). As a result of the exploratory factor analysis, it was found that the total explained variance was 42%. Factor loads of the scale items were calculated between 0.54 and 0.76. In the confirmatory factor analysis, compliance index values were found as RMSEA = 0.08, SRMR = 0.04, GFI = 0.96, NFI = 0.94, RFI = 0.92, CFI = 0.95 and IFI = 0.95. The Psychological Well-being Scale was found to be related to the sub-dimensions of the scale, with autonomy being 0.30, environmental dominance being 0.53, individual development being 0.29, positive relations with others being 0.41, life goals being 0.41, self-acceptance being 0.56 and total psychological well-being being 0.56. In addition, the sub-dimensions of the Need Satisfaction Scale correlated with autonomy as 0.30, with

competence as 0.69, with relevance as 0.57 and with total need satisfaction as 0.73. Cronbach's alpha internal consistency coefficient obtained in the reliability study of the scale was calculated as 0.80. According to the test-retest results, a high, positive and significant correlation was found between the first and second applications of the scale ($r = 0.86$, $p < 0.001$). The total correlations of the items of the Psychological Well-being Scale varied between 0.41 and 0.63 and *t*-values were verified as significant ($p < 0.001$). The items of the Psychological Well-being Scale ranged between 1 and 7, with strongly disagree (1) and strongly agree (7). All items were expressed positively. The scores ranged from 8 (if all items are answered as I strongly disagree) to 56 (if all items are answered as I strongly agree). A high score indicates that a person has many psychological resources and powers. For this study, Cronbach's alpha internal consistency coefficient was calculated as 0.90 for the whole scale.

2.2.3. Process

In this study, which was conducted with the relational survey technique, the variables of giftedness, human values and psychological well-being were carefully selected to determine the possible relationship. Afterwards, scales and personal information form about variables were brought together to reach the main variables. Necessary permissions were obtained for the application form, and applications were carried out within one lesson hour through the guidance of teachers and administrators in the schools. Before starting the scale application, the students were informed about the purpose and importance of the application, they were asked whether they were willing to participate before volunteering. Only the students who were willing participated in the study. Having transferred the obtained data to a computer, the data were analysed by parametric tests (kurtosis and skewness values were between −1.96 and +1.96). Data were analysed by the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences-25 package programme. Independent samples *t*-test was used for binary comparisons, Pearson's product-moment correlation analysis was used for variable correlations and regression analysis was used to determine the predictive level. The confidence interval was taken as$p<$ 0.05 significance level.

3. Findings

3.1. Comparison analysis

As the Kolmogorov–Smirnov statistical value for human values was 0.079 ($p > 0.05$) for gifted/talented students, 0.065 ($p>0.05$) for their peers with average development, 0.098 ($p > 0.05$) for psychologic well-being for gifted/talented students and 0.072 ($p > 0.05$) for their peers with average development, it can be said that the data were normally distributed according to whether being gifted/talented or not. Therefore, to compare the human values and psychological well-being of gifted/talented students with the human values and psychological well-being of their peers with average development, the independent samples *t*-test from parametric tests was carried out and the results are shown in Table 1.

Table 1. *T*-test results of human values and psychological well-being levels according to whether the students are gifted/talented or not

	Student	*N*	X	SD	*t*	*p*
Responsibility	Average	328	37.46	0.6092		
	Gifted	225	39.34	0.6632	−5.653	0.000
Friendship	Average	328	40.60	0.6032		
	Gifted	225	41.82	0.5871	−3.940	0.000
Peacefulness	Average	328	37.98	0.6323		
	Gifted	225	40.30	0.6249	−7.073	0.000
Respect	Average	328	39.10	0.6546		
	Gifted	225	39.99	0.6395	−2.507	0.012
Honesty	Average	328	38.47	0.5938		
	Gifted	225	40.74	0.5745	−7.426	0.000

Tolerance	Average	328	36.16	0.6625		
	Gifted	225	38.80	0.6566	7.668	0.000
Human Values Total	Average	328	36.84	0.4019		
	Gifted	225	37.86	0.3813	−4.974	0.000
Psych. Well-beingTotal	Average	328	46.25	0.9761		
	Gifted	225	48.88	0.6092	−5.057	0.000

*$p < 0.05$

As shown in Table 1, the mean values of gifted/talented students' human values (= 37.86) were statistically significantly higher than the mean values (= 36.84) of their peers with average development (= 36.84) (t = −4.974, $p < 0.005$). The mean values of human values sub-dimensions for gifted/talented students for responsibility (t = −5.653, $p < 0.005$), friendship (t = −3.940, $p < 0.005$), peacefulness (t = −7.073, $p < 0.005$), respect (t = −2.507, $p < 0.005$), honesty (t = −7.426, $p < 0.005$) and tolerance (t = 7.668, $p < 0.005$) were statistically significantly higher than their peers with average development. Similarly, the mean values of gifted/talented students' psychological well-being ($\overline{X}$ = 48.88) were statistically significantly higher than their peers with average development ($\overline{X}$ = 46.25).

To determine the status of gifted/talented students' human values nd psychological well-being according to the gender variable, the *t*-test was applied and the results are shown in Table 2.

Table 2. *T*-test results of psychological well-being levels of gifted/talented students according to the gender variable

	Gender	*N*	*M*	*SD*	*t*	*p*
Human values	Female	118	37.84	0.3643		
	Male	107	38.11	0.3805	−1.191	0.234
Psychological well-being	Female	118	47.89	1.0629		
	Male	107	48.59	1.0188	−0.880	0.379

*$p < 0.05$

As shown in Table 2, there is no statistically significant difference between the mean scores of psychological well-being ($\overline{X}$ = 47.89) of gifted/talented male students and the mean score of psychological well-being ($\overline{X}$ = 36.84) of gifted/talented female students (t = −0.880)., $p < 0.005$).

In order to determine whether there is a correlation between human values and psychological well-being of gifted/talented students, Pearson's product-moment correlation analysis was applied and the results are shown in Table 3.

3.2. Correlation analysis

Table 3. Pearson's correlation matrix showing the correlations between human values and psychological well-being of gifted students

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
1.Responsibility	–							
2.Friendship	0.404**							
3.Peacefulness	0.562**	0.399**						
4.Respect	0.623**	0.428**	0.616**					
5.Honesty	0.669**	0.326**	0.506**	0.489**				
6.Tolerance	0.557**	0.416**	0.574**	0.652**	0.534**			
7.Humanvalues	0.652**	0.657**	0.662**	0.732**	0.488**	0.639**		
8. Psych. Well-being	0.300**	0.242**	0.291**	0.342**	0.253**	0.330**	0.367**	
$\overline{X}$	39.34	41.82	40.30	39.94	40.74	38.80	37.86	48.21
SD	0.6632	0.5871	0.6249	0.6395	0.5745	0.6566	0.3813	1.0414

*$p < 0.05$; **$p < 0.01$.

As seen in Table 3, there is a statistically significant and positive correlation between human values and psychological well-being of gifted/talented students (r = 37 and p < 0.01). In other words, as human values increase, so does psychological well-being. It is possible to say the same for the correlation between human values sub-dimensions and psychological well-being. Furthermore, human values have a positive correlation between the sub-dimensions.

The simple regression analysis was carried out to see the role of human values variable in predicting psychological well-being levels of the gifted/talented students and the results are shown in Table 4.

Table 4. Regression analysis of the correlation values between human values and psychological well-being of the gifted/talented students (n = 225)

Variable	Non-standard Coefficients		Standardised Coefficients		
Model	B	SH	*β*	*t*	*p*
(invariant)	1.028	0.365		2.814	0.005
Human values	1.002	0.096	0.367	10.431	0.000

*p < 0.05; **p < 0.01.

In Table 4, the regression analysis conducted to see the role of values variable in predicting psychological well-being shows that the human values variable significantly predicts psychological well-being (F = 108.801, p < 0.001, R = 0.37, R2 = 0.14). According to the results of this analysis, the contribution of the variable to the variance is 14%. The contribution of human values to the variance was significant (β = 0.367, t = 10.431, p < 0.001).

4. Discussion and conclusion

The main objective of this study was to compare the human values and psychological well-being of gifted/talented students with those of their peers with standard development. In addition, it aimed to determine the level of relationship between human values and psychological well-being of gifted/talented students, and whether human values were effective on psychological well-being. For this purpose, some hypotheses were tested.

In the first hypothesis of the study, it was claimed that the level of human values of gifted/talented students would be statistically significantly higher than that of their peers with average development. According to the research findings, the level of human values of gifted students is statistically significantly higher than their peers. Ozbey (2016) and Ozbey and Saricam (2016) found that the human values of gifted/talented students were higher than those of their peers with an average development. In another study, Ozbey, Saricam and Adam Karduz (2018) found that the social value perceptions of gifted/talented students were higher than those of their peers with average development. According to Hokelekli and Gunduz's (2004) study, gifted/talented students have high tendencies for benevolence and peaceableness. However, their value orientations, such as 'power', are low. According to the findings of Kuraz, Ciftci and Karapazar (2013), friendship, righteousness, compassion, forgiveness and contentment are the hallmarks of gifted students. Tirri and Pehkonen (1998) reached a conclusion in their studies that the sense of responsibility of gifted/talented students is highly developed, and they are in particular extremely sensitive to the injustice against individuals in daily life as well as they do not compromise ethical rules in science. Cetinkaya and Kincal (2015) found that gifted/talented children carry higher levels of the characteristics of being respectful to people's rights, prudent, patient and attaching importance to freedom than average students. Topcu's (2015) study shows that gifted/talented students believe that respect, tolerance and being good people are the values that people should have in social life, and they are the priorities that direct one's life. According to the findings of Er and Unal (2015), gifted/talented students attach great importance to the concepts of freedom, equality, respect for thought and reconciliation. Every gifted/talented individual has a unique social–emotional character. Their cognitive abilities, strong observations and intuitions, advanced understanding and comprehension strengths, a sense of justice and a culture of

inquiry enable them to have a strong moral identity. They have an advanced sense of justice, and their sense of compassion and human values is very high (Winner, 1997).

According to the second finding of the study, psychological well-being levels of gifted/talented students were significantly higher than those of their peers with average development. Terman (1925), one of the first researchers in the field, based on his longitudinal study on gifted/talented children suggested that gifted/talented children have less psychological problems than their average peers. In a longitudinal study on gifted/talented young people in the field of mathematics, their levels of psychological well-being, life satisfaction and overall life achievement were higher than expected (Lubinski, Benbow & Kell, 2014). In another longitudinal study (35 years), Hertzog and Chung (2015) found that students were in very good states in terms of educational, occupational and socio-emotional outcomes in general. The participants stated that they were either very happy or happy concerning their academic success (97.4%), family (93.2%), friendship (87.9%), work (87.4%), finances (82.7%) and romantic relationships (77.2%). Maaulot, Faisal, Ishak, Lani and Ing (2015) reported that the majority of gifted students have a high level of psychological well-being, are aware of their environment and engage more in 'happy activities'. In different studies, it was found that psychological well-being levels (Gholamrezaei, Poorshafei & Dastjerdi, 2009; Luthar, Zigler & Goldstein, 1992), life satisfaction levels (Sun-Mi & Mi-Hyun, 2013), social security and satisfaction levels (Ozbey, 2016) of gifted/talented students were higher than those of their peers with average development. In general, although there is a tendency stating that gifted students have higher levels of psychological well-being, this does not mean that gifted/talented students do not face problems or difficulties (Moon, 2009). As a matter of fact, there are studies suggesting that the psychological well-being levels of gifted/talented people are lower (Fonseca, 2011; Peterson, 2009). There are different social and emotional needs arising from the mismatch between the cognitive and physical development of gifted children (Morawska & Sanders, 2008; Neihart, 2006; Terrassier, 2009; Yun, Chung, Jang, Kim & Jeong, 2011). Relationships with their peers, educators, educational institutions, family and social competence generally affect the psychological well-being of gifted/talented students (Neihart, 1999; Plunkett & Kronborg, 2011). In this context, concerning the findings of this research stating that psychological well-being of gifted/talented students are better than those of their standard developing peers, it can be said that satisfaction in the field of their talent, a suitable circle of friends for their mental age and development, teachers, education and family circle play an important role.

In the second hypothesis of the study, it was claimed that psychological well-being levels of gifted/talented students would be statistically higher in favour of males. According to the findings of the study, although the scores of male students were high, they were not statistically significant. Based on this result, it can be said that gender is not an effective variable on the psychological well-being of gifted/talented students, and boys and girls have similar psychological statuses, happiness levels and general life satisfaction. There are studies supporting the research findings. According to Maaulot et al.'s (2015) study, gender and race do not affect the psychological well-being of gifted/talented students. Lubinski, Benbow and Kell (2014) concluded that the level of psychological well-being, adaptation and satisfaction of gifted men and women was equal. Ozbey (2016) found that the gender factor had no significant effect on the social trust and satisfaction of gifted/talented students. These results show that the psychosocial development needs of both groups were satisfied. There may be differences between genders in terms of psychological well-being due to biological and psychological differences, better individual/family life, interpersonal relationships, effective communication skills, more tolerance towards female employees, lower expectations than men, etc. (Akhter, 2015). While Fouladchang, While Kohgard and Salah (2010) state that gifted/talented girls had a better life satisfaction than gifted/talented boys, Bergold et al. (2015) drew conflicting conclusions stating that men had a better life satisfaction.

According to the results of the analysis comparing the levels of human values of gifted/talented students according to gender variable, there is no statistical significance although male students' scores were higher. Ozbey (2016) found that for gifted/talented students, gender did not cause a

significant difference in human values. Cetinkaya and Kincal (2015) reached a conclusion that although the levels of love, tolerance and democracy awareness of gifted/talented female students were higher, there is no significant difference. Kangal (2010) found that gender did not cause a significant difference in moral judgments of gifted/talented students.

In the third hypothesis of the study, it was claimed that there would be a statistically significant correlation between human values and psychological well-being of gifted/talented students. According to the research findings, there is a positive significant correlation between human values (with sub-dimensions) and psychological well-being of gifted/talented students. Although there are many studies on the relationship between values and psychological well-being in the related field, no direct study has been found on gifted/talented students. Research by Bilbao, Techio and Paez (2008), Fischer and Boer (2016), Sortheix and Lonnqvist (2015), Bobowik, Basabe, Paez, Jimenez and Bilbao (2011), and Sagiv and Schwartz (2000) show that there is a correlation between values and psychological well-being. Moral sensitivity has a positive correlation with psychological well-being and a negative correlation with anxiety, and psychological well-being and moral sensitivity make one feel confident in doing the right things (Olson, 1998). Friendship is an important need for both children and adults. It is an important factor for the development of their social selves. Having a loving and satisfying relationship with the environment contributes to long-term psychological well-being (Caunt, Franklin, Brodaty & Brodaty, 2013; Miething et al., 2016). Friendship is also an important value for gifted students and has a priority in their social/emotional development. Indeed, Silverman (1993) reports that when gifted children are asked what they want most, the answer is usually 'friend'. Moral responsibility (Keller & Edelstein, 1993), honesty (Torka, 2018), freedom, responsibility and peaceableness (Samson, Alessandra & Monica, 2015), forgiveness (Bono, McCullough & Root, 2008), helpfulness and success (Cohen & Shamai, 2010) and the meaning of life (Garcia-Alandete, 2015) have been reported to be related to the psychological well-being in different studies. When values such as responsibility (Roeper & Silverman, 2009), friendship, honesty, forgiveness (Kurnaz, Ciftci & Karapazar, 2013), tolerance and respect (Topcu, 2015) are considered among the characteristics of gifted/talented students, a positive significant correlation between human values and psychological well-being is an acceptable result.

In the fourth hypothesis of the study, it was claimed that the levels of human values of gifted/talented students predict their psychological well-being. According to the research findings, the levels of human values of gifted/talented students statistically significantly predict their psychological well-being. McCulloch (1991) suggested that values, moral sensitivity, positive relationships and social support increase the psychological well-being and level of life quality. According to Fontaine et al.'s (2008) study, values that manage relationships in social life (universalism, helpfulness, tradition, harmony and security etc.) can contribute to psychological well-being. True happiness (eudaimonia) is not a pursuit of pure pleasure. Values are an inseparable whole with psychological well-being since they enable individuals to reach their goals more easily with high motivation, and they are principles that develop the meaning of life, social relationships and sense of self (Compton, 2001; Ryan, Huta & Deci, 2008; Sagiv & Schwartz, 2000). In particular, when the values of a person are compatible with the values that are valid in the social environment in which the person lives, psychological well-being as well as social groups', individual and organisational development are positively affected (Ciarrochi, Kashdan & Harris, 2013; Sortheix, 2014). Indeed, Samson et al. (2015) and Torka (2018) report that honesty, forgiveness and other universal values are a prerequisite for true happiness, life satisfaction and psychological well-being. According to Blackett and Webb's (2011) study, gifted/talented individuals can establish relationships with other people more easily, solve interpersonal problems, detect problems that may arise and take precautions. In other words, gifted students can be expected to be more peaceful and harmonious with society due to the differences they have. The value system of gifted/talented people (friendship, responsibility, empathy, justice, optimism, helpfulness, tolerance, peacefulness, sensitivity, etc.) affects their behaviour, social and emotional aspects positively (Pramathevan & Garces-Bacsal, 2012). Therefore, it is a plausible result that human values are predicting the psychological well-being of gifted/talented students.

As a result, human values and psychological well-being of gifted/talented students were found to be higher than those of their average peers. There is a statistically significant correlation between human values and psychological well-being of the gifted/talented, and human values significantly increase the level of psychological well-being. In addition, the gender variable is not an influential factor in the level of psychological well-being of gifted/talented students.

According to these results, human values are important factors for psychological well-being of gifted/talented students. Therefore, it would be beneficial to include human values in educational and implicit programmes for gifted/talented children to internalise human values. Considering that they are individuals who love to serve others, their participation in social welfare activities and even the opportunity to prepare their own projects will strengthen these feelings (Ozbey, 2016).

When the results (obtained in) of this study are examined, it is necessary to draw attention to some limitations before reaching a clear judgment. First of all, this study was limited to two provinces, certain schools and eighth-grade students. In this respect, it can be stated that the number of participants is insufficient. Therefore, studies with different provinces and groups of students in different classes will give different dimensions to this research.

References

Akhter, S. (2015). Psychological well-being in student of gender difference. *The International Journal of Indian Psychology, 2*(4), 153–161.

Akyuz, I. (2014). Turkiye' degenclik, din vedegerlerkonusundayapilanampirikarastimalarinyontemveicerikanalizi. *Journal of Faculty of Theology, Sakarya University/Sakarya Universitesillahiyat Fakultesi Dergisi*, *15*(30), 1–20.

Al-Adwan, F. E. Z. & Al-Khayat, M. M. (2015). Cognitive and emotional needs of the gifted students from themselves perspective: survey. *Canadian Social Science, 11*(7), 38–48.

Bilbao, M. A., Techio, E. M. & Paez, D. (2007). Felicidad, cultura y valorespersonales: estado de la cuestiony sintesismeta-analitica. *Revista de Psicologia (Lima), 25*(2), 135–276.

Blackett, R. & Webb, J. T. (2011). The social-emotional dimension of giftedness: the seng support model. *Australasian Journal of Gifted Educatio, 20*(1), 5–13.

Bobowik, M., Basabe, N., Paez, D., Jimenez, A. & Bilbao, M. A. (2011). Personal values and well-being among Europeans, Spanish natives and immigrants to Spain: does the culture matter? *Journal of Happiness Studies, 12*(3), 401–419.

Bono, G., McCullough, M. E. & Root, L. M. (2008). Forgiveness, feeling connected to others, and well-being: two longitudinal studies. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 34*(2), 182–195.

Brey, P. (2015). Design for the value of human well-being. In J. van den Hoven, P. Vermaas & I. van de Poel (Eds), *Handbook of ethics, values, and technological design. Sources, theory, values and application domains* (pp. 365–382). New York, NY: Springer.

Brown, K. W. & Kasser, T. (2005). Are psychological and ecological well-being compatible? The role of values, mindfulness, and lifestyle. *Social Indicators Research, 74*(2), 349–368.

Caunt, B. S., Franklin, J., Brodaty, N. E. & Brodaty, H. (2013). Exploring the causes of subjective well-being: a content analysis of peoples' recipes for long-term happiness. *Journal of Happiness Studies, 14*(2), 475–499.

Cetinkaya, C. & Kincal, R. Y. (2015). Ustunzekaliveyeteneklicocuklarindemokrasiegitimi. *Ustun Yetenekliler Egitimive Arastirmalari Dergisi (UYAD)*, *3*(1).

Ciarrochi, J., Kashdan, T. B. & Harris, R. (2013). The foundations of flourishing. In T. B. Kashdan & J. Ciarrochi (Eds.), *Mindfulness, acceptance, and positive psychology.* Oakland, CA: Context Press.

Cohen, A. & Shamai, O. (2010). The relationship between individual values, psychological well-being, and organizational commitment among Israeli police officers. *Policing: An International Journal of Police Strategies and Management, 33*(1), 30–51.

Compton, W. (2001). The values problem in subjective well-being. *American Psychologist, 56,* 84.

Corso, R. M. (2007). Practices for enhancing children's social-emotional development and preventing challenging behavior. *Gifted Child Today, 30*(3), 51–56.

Cross, T. L. (2011). Walking the straight and narrow: the role of school punishment in the emotional decline of the gifted student. *Gifted Child Today, 34*(2), 43–44.

Daniels, S. & Piechowski, M. M. (2009). Living with intensity: understanding the sensitivity, excitability, and emotional development of gifted children, adolescents, and adults. Goshen, KY: Great Potential Press, Inc.

Davidov, E., Schmidt, P. & Schwartz, S. H. (2008). Bringing values back In: The adequacy of the European social survey to measure values in 20 countries. *Public Opinion Quarterly, 72*(3), 420–445.

Deci, E. L. & Ryan, R. M. (2008). Facilitating optimal motivation and psychological well-being across life's domains. *Canadian Psychology/PsychologieCanadienne, 49*(1), 14.

Deiner, E., Lucas, R. E. & Oishi, S. (2002). Subjective well-being: the science of happiness and life satisfaction. In The hand book of positive psychology (pp. 63–73). New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

Delaune, A. & Tapper, L. (2015). The well-being of gifted young children: perceptions, pedagogy, and governance. *He Kupu, 4*(2).

Diener, E. (2000). Subjective wellbeing: the science of happiness and a proposal for a national index. *American Psychological Association, 55*, 34–43.

Diener, E. & Fujita, F. (1995). Resources, personal strivings, and subjective well-being: anomothetic and idiographic approach. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 68*,926–935. doi:10.1037/0022-3514.68.5.926

Edwards, S. D., Ngcobo, H. S., Edwards, D. J. & Palavar, K. (2005). Exploring the relationship between physical activity, psychological well-being and physical self-perception in different exercise groups. *South African Journal for Research in Sport, Physical Education and Recreation, 27*(1), 59–74.

Eggleston, E., Wong, E. L., Hardee, K., Irwanto, Poerwandari, E. K. & Severy, L. J. (2001). Measuring women's psychological well-being in Indonesia. *Women and Health, 32*(4), 17–32.

Er, H. & Unal, F. (2015). Ustunyetenekliogrencilerindemokrasiyeiliskingorselalgilarinininincelenmesi. *PAU Egitim Fakakultesi Dergisi, 38*, 93–106.

Fierro, A. (2006). Emotional intelligence, does associate to happiness? A province outline. *Ansiedad y Estres, 12*(2–3), 241–249.

Fischer, R. & Boer, D. (2016). Values: the dynamic nexus between biology, ecology and culture. *Current Opinion in Psychology, 8*, 155–160.

Fonseca, C. (2011). Emotional intensity in gifted students: helping kids cope with explosive feelings. Waco, TX: Prufrock Press, Inc.

Fouladchang, M., Kohgard, A. & Salah, V. (2010). A study of psychological health among students of gifted and nongifted high schools. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences, 5*, 1220–1225.

Garcia-Alandete, J. (2015). Does meaning in life predict psychological well-being? *The European Journal of Counselling Psychology, 3*(2). 89–98. doi:10.5964/ejcop.v3i2.27

Gere, D. R., Capps, S. C., Mitchell, D. W., Grubbs, E. & Dunn, W. (2009). Sensory sensitivities of gifted children/invited commentary on 'sensory sensitivities of gifted children'. *The American Journal of Occupational Therapy, 63*(3), 288–295.

Gholamrezaei, Z., Poorshafei, H. & Dastjerdi, R. (2009). Comparison psychological well-being in gifted and no gifted students. *Scientific Quarterly of Birj and Nursing and Midwifery Faculty, 6*, 1–4.

Gokalp, N. (2014). Kisi olmanindegerivedegerlerinkisiolmadakiyeri. *Degerler Egitimi Dergisi, 12*(27), 123–134.

Gross, M. U. (2006). Exceptionally gifted children: long-term outcomes of academic acceleration and non acceleration. *Journal for the Education of the Gifted, 29*(4), 404–429.

Grossi, E., Blessi, G. T., Sacco, P. L. & Buscema, M. (2012). The interaction between culture, health and psychological well-being: data mining from the Italian culture and well-being project. *Journal of Happiness Studies, 13*(1), 129–148.

Han, K. S. & Kim, Y. M. (2008). The research on the gifted children's happiness. *Journal of Gifted/Talented Education, 18*(3), 519–542.

Hertzog, N. B. & Chung, R. U. (2015). Outcomes for students on a fast track to college: early college entrance programs at the University of Washington. *Roeper Review, 37*(1), 39–49.

Hidalgo, J. L., Bravo, B. N., Martinez, I. P., Pretel, F. A., Postigo, J. M. L. & Rabadan, F. E. (2010). Psychological well-being, assessment tools and related factors. In I. E. Wells (Ed.), *Psychological well-being* (pp. 77–113). New York, NY: Nova Science Publishers.

Hokelekli, H. & veGunduz, T. (2004). UstunYetenekliCocuklarinKarakterOzelliklerive DegerlerEgitimi. I. Turkiye Ustun Yetenekli Cocuklar Kongresi. Istanbul, Turkey: Marmara Universitesi Ataturk Egitim Fakultesi.

Huppert, F. A. (2009). Psychological well-being: evidence regarding its causes and consequences. *Applied Psychology: Health and Well-Being, 1*, 137–164. doi:10.1111/j.1758-0854.2009.01008.x

Keller, M. & Edelstein, W. (1993). The development of moral self from childhood to adolescence. In G. G. Noam & T. G. Wren (Eds.), *The moral self* (pp. 310–336). Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Keyes, C. L., Shmotkin, D. & Ryff, C. D. (2002). Optimizing well-being: The empirical encounter of two traditions. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 82*(6), 1007–1022.

Kim, S. M. & Yoo, M. H. (2013). Comparison of time management behavior, life satisfaction between gifted middle school students and general students, and relationship between the time management behaviors and life satisfaction. *Journal of Gifted/Talented Education, 23*(3), 315–333.

Kumar, R. (2014). Relationship between psychological well-being and values among adolescents. *Indian Journal of Positive Psychology, 5*(4), 496.

Kurnaz, A., Ciftci, U. & Karapazar, H. (2013). Ustunzekaliveyetenekliogrencilerindegeralgilarininbetimselbiranalizi. *Degerler Egitimi Dergisi, 11*(26), 185–225.

Lu, L. & Shih, J. B. (1997). Personality and happiness: Is mental health a mediator? *Personality and Individual Differences, 22*, 249–256.

Lu, L., Gilmour, R. & Kao, S. F. (2001). Cultural values and happiness: an east-west dialogue. *The Journal of Social Psychology, 141*(4), 477–493.

Lubinski, D., Benbow, C. P. & Kell, H. J. (2014). Life paths and accomplishments of mathematically precocious males and females four decades later. *Psychological Science, 25*(12), 2217–2232.

Luthar, S. S., Zigler, E. & Goldstein, D. (1992). Psychosocial adjustment among intellectually gifted adolescents: the role of cognitive-developmental and experiential factors. *Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry, 33*(2), 361–375.

Maaulot, N., Faisal, R. A., Ishak, N. M., Lani, N. N. & Ing, O. S. (2015). *Psychological well-being among gifted Students at the national gifted center in Malaysia*. Asian Conference on Psychology and Behavioral Sciences 2015 Official Conference Proceedings.

McGee, C. D. & Hughes, C. E. (2011). Identifying and supporting young gifted learners. *YC Young Children, 66*(4), 100–105.

Miething, A., Almquist, Y. B., Ostberg, V., Rostila, M., Edling, C. & Rydgren, J. (2016). Friendship networks and psychological well-being from late adolescence to young adulthood: a gender-specific structural equation modeling approach. *BMC Psychology, 4*(1), 34.

Moon, S. M. (2009). Myth 15: high-ability students don't face problems and challenges. *Gifted Child Quarterly, 53*(4), 274–276.

Morawska, A. & Sanders, M. R. (2008). Parenting gifted and talented children: what are the key child behaviour and parenting issues? *Australian and New Zealand Journal of Psychiatry, 42*(9), 819–827.

Myyrya, L., Juujarvi, S. & Pesso, K. (2010). Empathy, perspective taking and personal values as predictors of moral schemas. *Journal of Moral Education, 39*(2), 213–233.

Neihart, M. (1999). The impact of giftedness on psychological well-being: What does the empirical literature say? *Roeper Review, 22*(1), 10–17.

Neihart, M. (2006). Achievement/affiliation conflicts in gifted adolescents. *Roeper Review, 28*(4), 196–202.

Olson, L. M. (1998). The relationship between moral integrity, psychological wellbeing and anxiety. *Journal Based on Research Part of Dessertation in University of Wisconsin-Madison*.

Onder, M. & Bulut, H. (2013). Temeldini degerlervedegerleregitimi. *Erzincan Universitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitusu Dergisi, 6*(1), 15–32.

Ordonez, T. N., Lima-Silva, T. B. & Cachioni, M. (2011). Subjective and psychological well-being of students of a university of the third age: benefits of continuing education for psychological adjustment in the elderly. *Dementia and Neuropsychologia, 5*(3), 216–225.

Ozbey, A. (2016). *Ustunzeka/yeteneklive normal ogrencilerdeinsanidegerler, duyarlisevgi, sosyalguvenve memnuniyetduzeylerininkarsilastirilmasi.* Kutahya, Turkey: Doktoratezi. Dumlupinar Universitesi, Egitim Bilimleri Enstitusu.

Ozcan, Z. & Erol, H. (2017). Universiteogrencilerinindegeryonelimlerivedindarlik-degeriliskisi (KarabukOrnegi). *Journal of History Culture and Art Research, 6*(4), 913–947. doi:10.7596/taksad.v6i4.1091

Parks, L. & Guay, R. P. (2009). Personality, values, and motivation. *Personality and Individual Differences, 47*(7), 675–684.

Parks-Leduc, L., Feldman, G. & Bardi, A. (2015). Personality traits and personal values: a meta-analysis. *Personality and Social Psychology Review, 19*(1), 3–29.

Peterson, J. S. (2009). Myth 17: gifted and talented individuals do not have unique social and emotional needs. *The Gifted Child Quarterly, 53*(4), 280–282.

Peterson, J. & Lorimer, M. R. (2012). Small-group affective curriculum for gifted students: alongitudinal study of teacher-facilitators. *Roeper Review, 34*(3), 158–169. doi:10.1080/02783193.2012.686423.

Plunkett, M. & Kronborg, L. (2011). Learning to be a teacher of the gifted: the importance of examining opinions and challenging misconceptions. *Gifted and Talented International, 26*(1–2), 31–46.

Pramathevan, G. S. & Garces-Bacsal, R. M. (2012). Factors influencing altruism in the context of overseas learning experiences among gifted adolescent girls in Singapore. *Roeper Review, 34*(3), 145–157. doi:10.1080/02783193.2012.686421

Reis, S. M. & 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, 41*(1), 119–130.

Rennie, L. (2007). Values of science portrayed in out-of-school contexts. In D. Corrigan, J. Dillon, R. Gunstone (Ed.), *The re-emergence of values in science education* (pp.197–212).Rotterdam, Netherlands: Sense Publishers.

Riley, T. L., Sampson, C., White, V., Wardman, J. & Walker, D. (2015). Connecting like minded learners through flexible grouping. *Set,* (1), 25–33.

Robinson, N. M. (2008). The social world of gifted children and youth. In S. I. Pfeiffer (Ed.), *Handbook of giftedness in children* (pp. 33–51). New York, NY:Springer.

Roeper, A. & Silverman, L. K. (2009). Giftedness and moral promise. In:T. L. Cross& D. Ambrose (Ed.),*Morality, ethics, and gifted minds*(pp. 251–264). Boston, MA: Springer.

Ryan, R. M. & Deci, E. L. (2000). Self-determination theory and the facilitation of intrinsic motivation, social development, and well-being. *American Psychologist, 55*(1), 68.

Ryan, R. M. & Deci, E. L. (2001). On happiness and human potentials: a review of research on hedonic and eudaimonic well-being. *Annual Review of Psychology,52*(1), 141–166.

Ryan, R. M., Huta, V. & Deci, E. L. (2008). Living well: a self-determination theory perspective on eudaimonia. *Journal of Happiness Studies, 9*(1), 139–170.

Sagiv, L. & Schwartz, S. H. (2000). Value priorities and subjective well-being: direct relations and congruity effects. *European Journal of Social Psychology, 30*(2), 177–198.

Samson, D. A., Alessandra, S. & Monica, T. O. (2015). Psychological healing in reconciliation. *International Journal of School and Cognitive Psychology, 2*, 4.doi:10.4172/2469-9837.1000158

Seligman, M. (2010). Flourish: positive psychology and positive interventions. *The Tanner Lectures on Human Values, 31*, 229–243.

Seligman, M.E. & Csikszentmihalyi, M.(2000). Positive psychology: an introduction. *American Psychological Association, 55*(1), 5–14.

Silverman, L. K. (1993). Counselling the gifted and talented. Denver, CO: Love.

Silverman, L. K. (2003). Gifted children with learning disabilities. *Handbook of Gifted Education, 3*, 533–543.

Siqueira, M. M. M. & Padovam, V. A. R. (2008). Bases teoricasde bem-estarsubjetivo, bem-estarpsicologicoe bem-estar no trabalho. *Psicologia: Teoria e Pesquisa, 24*(2), 201–209.

Sortheix, F. M. & Lonnqvist, J. E. (2015). Person-group value congruence and subjective well-being in students from Argentina, Bulgaria and Finland: the role of interpersonal relationships. *Journal of Community and Applied Social Psychology, 25*(1), 34–48.

Tay, L. & Kuykendall, L. (2013). Promoting happiness: the malleability of individual and societal subjective wellbeing. *International Journal of Psychology, 48*(3), 159–176.

Terman, L. M. (1925). Genetic studies of genius...: mental and physical traits of a thousand gifted children, by LM Terman, assisted by BT Baldwin, Edith Bronson, and others (vol. 1). Palo Alto, CA: Stanford University Press.

Terrassier, J. C. (2009). Intellectually precocious children. *Archives de Pediatrie: Organe Officielde la Societe Francaise de Pediatrie, 16*(12), 1603–1606.

Thompson, K. S. (1981). Changes in the values and life-style preferences of university students. *The Journal of Higher Education,* 52, 506–518.

Tirri, K. & Pehkonen, L. (1998). *The moral reasoning of adolescents gifted in science: a case study*. Annual conference of the European Council for High Ability. Oxford, UK.

Topcu, S. (2015). Ustunzekaliogrencilerindegerkavraminayonelikalgilari: elazigbilimvesanatmerkeziornegi. *Electronic Turkish Studies, 10*(11), 1449–1470.

Torka, N. (2018). Honesty and genuine happiness. *British Journal of Guidance and Counselling,* 1–11. doi:10.1080/03069885.2018.1453600

Ulavere, P. & Veisson, M. (2015). Values and values education in estonian preschool child care institutions. *Journal of Teacher Education for Sustainability, 17*(2), 108–124.

Van der Zee, K., Thijs, M. & Schakel, L. (2002). The relationship of emotional intelligence with academic intelligence and the big five. *European Journal of Personality, 16*(2), 103–125.

Ward, R. A. (2008). Multiple parent–adult child relations and well-being in middle and later life. *The Journals of Gerontology Series B: Psychological Sciences and Social Sciences, 63*(4), S239–S247.

Wigtil, C. J. & Henriques, G. R. (2015). The relationship between intelligence and psychological well-being in incoming college students. *Psychology of Well-Being, 5*(1), 4.

Winner, E. (1997). *Gifted children: Myths and realities*. New York, NY: Basic Books.

Yun, K., Chung, D., Jang, B., Kim, J. H. & Jeong, J. (2011). Mathematically gifted adolescents have deficiencies in social valuation and mentalization. *PloSOne, 6*(4), e18224.

Ziegler, A. & Raul, T. (2000). Myth and reality: a review of empirical studies on giftedness. *High Ability Studies, 11*, 113–136.