

Examining the Fears of Gifted Children

Jacalyn G. Tippey and Joy J. Burnham
The University of Alabama

Few studies have considered the fears of gifted children. Using the American Fear Survey Schedule for Children (FSSC-AM; Burnham, 1995), a modified version of the Australian Fear Survey Schedule for Children-II (Gullone & King, 1992, 1993), this study focused on the fears of 287 gifted children ages 7–10. This study is a first step in developing contemporary normative data in fears of gifted children. Two a priori discriminant analyses were used to investigate which factor scores discriminated between gender and ethnicity. Additionally, 2 item analyses were completed to examine which fear items on the FSSC-AM discriminated between gender and ethnicity. Results are reported and compared to previous studies. Implications and recommendations for future fear research with gifted children also are discussed. Further research is necessary to discern differences in fears of gifted children and their peers.

Gifted children often are compared to their nongifted counterparts. Research has suggested that gifted children progress through the same developmental stages as their peers, although frequently at younger ages (Webb & Kleine, 1993). Nonetheless, gifted children can be distinguished from nongifted children by certain characteristics. Gifted students are especially at risk for underachievement (Neihart, Reis, Robinson, & Moon, 2002). The reasons for underachievement may include social isolation, family dynamics and pressures to conform, lack of academic stimulation, attention seeking or rebelliousness, learning or behavioral disabilities, lack of direction (Neihart et al., 2002), and avoidance of taking risks (Whitmore & Maker, 1985). Gifted children also are prone to engage in excessive self-criticism, often seeing possibilities and alternatives of what they might be, and, simultaneously, berating themselves because they see how they are falling short of an ideal (Adderholdt-Elliott, 1989; Powell & Haden, 1984; Whitmore & Maker, 1985). Other attributes often develop in gifted youth, including motor skills that lag behind cognitive and con-

Jacalyn Tippey has studied children's fears with Dr. Burnham for 3 years; she has worked with children in public mental health, private practice, and high school. Joy Burnham has studied children's fears for 12 years; she has administered the American Fear Survey for Children (FSSC-AM; Burnham, 2005) to more than 2,000 students in grades 2–12 in four states and has authored or coauthored nine national/international articles related to children's fears.

Journal for the Education of the Gifted. Vol. 32, No. 3, 2009, pp. 321–339. Copyright ©2009 Prufrock Press Inc., <http://www.prufrock.com>

ceptual abilities (Webb & Kleine, 1993), the desire to organize people and things, the need to invent complex games, and attempts to organize playmates (Adderholdt-Elliott, 1989; Powell & Haden, 1984).

Fears of Gifted Children

Research on the fears of gifted children is sparse, very general in nature, and is dated. Only four fear studies on gifted children in more than 100 years of fear research were found by the authors (i.e., Jersild & Holmes, 1935a, 1935b; Maurer, 1965; Stevenson, Batten, & Cherner, 1992; Wolman, 1978). Historically speaking, Jersild and Holmes (1935a, 1935b), the first researchers to publish information pertaining to the fears of gifted youth, established that gifted children develop fears earlier in life and overcome their fears at a younger age. In the 1960s, Maurer added another perspective to research examining fears in gifted youth by postulating that motivational and maturational factors impact fear development of gifted children. More than 40 years after Jersild and Holmes' (1935a, 1935b) seminal studies, Wolman posited that gifted children move through the normal developmental stages of fear (e.g., "fear of darkness" and "strangers" in the early years to "nuclear war" and "political issues" in adolescence), nonetheless at an accelerated rate in comparison to nongifted children. Wolman also noted that gifted children were typically more aware of real dangers than their peers. Similar to Jersild and Holmes' (1935a, 1935b) work, Wolman concluded that gifted children (i.e., over age 6) had fewer fears than nongifted children. Generally, within the limited fear research available, researchers have found differences between gifted and nongifted children. For instance, Maurer, Stevenson et al., and Wolman identified factors (i.e., genetic influence, intelligence, motivation, maturity) that contribute to the fear differences found between gifted and nongifted children. However, more focus on fear comparisons between gifted and nongifted children is essential.

Research has strongly indicated that gifted children think and behave differently than their peers (Gross, 1993; Hébert & Speirs Neumeister, 2003; Piechowski, 1991; Webb, Gore, Amend, & Devries, 2007). For example, the qualities of moderately to exceptionally gifted children include early moral concern, the ability to

distinguish many sides of a question, allegorical thinking, intellectual curiosity, fascination with ideas and words, and a need for precision (Hébert & Speirs Neumeister, 2003; Silverman, 1995). In comparison to their nongifted peers, gifted children have been reported to develop asynchronously, excessively criticize themselves, avoid risk-taking, experience higher levels of emotional intensity than their peers, and be more sensitive to rejection by peers (Silverman, 1995).

Gender

Gender differences have been commonly found in fear studies for decades, yet little is known about gender differences in fears of gifted children. In the general population of children, girls have consistently reported greater fear intensity than boys (Bamber, 1974; Burnham, 1995, 2005; Cooley-Quille, Boyd, Frantz, & Walsh, 2001; Gullone & King, 1993, 1997; Ollendick, 1983; Ollendick, Matson, & Helsel, 1985; Scherer & Nakamura, 1968). Girls also have reported greater numbers of fears than boys (Bamber, 1979; Burnham & Gullone, 1997; Gullone & King, 1993; King, Mulhall, & Gullone, 1989; Lapouse & Monk, 1959; Scherer & Nakamura, 1968). The rationale for the differences in gender has been discussed in a few studies. For instance, Gullone and King (1993) and Ginsburg and Silverman (2000) proposed that differences in fearfulness between boys and girls may be influenced by dissimilar societal expectations of boys and girls. In other words, from this standpoint, boys may hide fears, while girls may be more frank and open about fears.

Boys and girls have been found to have different fear content in studies. Girls have been found to be more fearful of the dark; strange sights; sounds; objects or persons; being kidnapped, robbed or killed; dirt; and animals (Gullone & King, 1993). In contrast, boys have been found to be more fearful of stimuli including harm, bodily injury, school failure, nightmares, and imaginary creatures (Bamber, 1974, 1979; Cummings, 1944; Jersild & Holmes, 1935a; Jersild, Markey, & Jersild, 1933; Lapouse & Monk, 1959; Poznanski, 1973; Pratt, 1945; Winker, 1949). In using discriminant analysis for the first time in a fear study, Gullone and King (1993) reported that girls scored higher on all of the fear items, indicating that the following fears most strongly discriminated between girls and boys: "rats," "spi-

ders," "snakes," "mice," "creepy houses," "being alone," and "having bad dreams."

Culture

Commonalities have been found in the prevalence and patterns of fears among children in different cultures and countries. For example, Burnham and Gullone (1997) found common fears as well as consistencies in age and gender across the U.S. and Australia. Studies have found similarities in the number of fears (i.e., average of 14 fears reported by children) across two countries (i.e., U.S. and Australia; Ollendick, King, & Frary, 1989). Other studies also have found similar results across nationalities (Ollendick et al., 1989; Ollendick, Yang, Dong, Xia, & Lin, 1995; Ollendick, Yang, King, Dong, & Akande, 1996; Shore & Rapport, 1998).

Differences in fears also have been found that are reflective of cultural norms (Ollendick et al., 1996). To illustrate, researchers have suggested that children raised in cultures favoring inhibition, conformity, and obedience will have increased internalizing behaviors (i.e., fear, anxiety, depression, fears of social judgment; Dong, Yang, & Ollendick, 1994; Ollendick et al., 1996). In addition, children from cultures with more restrictive parenting styles, such as Nigeria, Asia, Hawaii, and the Philippines, endorsed fears at higher levels than American, Australian, and Chinese youth (Ollendick et al., 1996; Shore & Rapport, 1998).

Ethnicity

To date, only one study was found that examined ethnicity across the three largest racial groups in the U.S. Burnham and Lomax (in press-a) compared White, Black, and Hispanic American children and found White elementary children had significantly higher school/family related fears than Black elementary children. Conversely, Black children had significantly higher animal fears than White children.

Socioeconomic Factors

Children from low-income families have been found to report greater fear intensity and fear frequency and a higher number of fears (Cooley-Quille et al., 2001; Croake, 1969; Erol & Sahin, 1995; Sidana, 1967). These findings were consistent across culture, ethnicity, and geographic locale (Cooley-Quille et al., 2001; Erol & Sahin, 1995). Graziano, DeGiovanni, and Garcia (1979) projected that the fears of low socioeconomic status (SES) children indicate that they perceive their environments as more hostile and dangerous than their middle or upper SES peers. For example, fears that are more characteristic of lower SES children include animals, strange people, being abandoned by parents, death, violence, and policemen. On the other hand, fears of heights and health concerns dominated middle and upper SES children (Angelino, Dollins & Mech, 1956; Bamber, 1974; Jersild & Holmes, 1935a; Jersild et al., 1933; Nalven, 1970).

The Current Study

This study sought to fill the dearth of fear research on gifted children using the following methods: (a) Discriminant analysis to compare which factor scores on the American Fear Survey Schedule for Children (FSSC-AM) discriminated between gender and ethnicity, and (b) item analysis to determine which items on the FSSC-AM discriminated between gender and ethnicity. The four hypotheses were (a) factor scores on the FSSC-AM will discriminate between gender for gifted boys and girls aged 7–10, similar to the Fear Survey Schedule for Children-II (FSSC-II; Gullone & King, 1993); (b) fear items on the FSSC-AM will discriminate between gender for gifted boys and girls aged 7–10, similar to the FSSC-II (Gullone & King, 1993); (c) factor scores of the FSSC-AM will discriminate between ethnicity for gifted boys and girls aged 7–10, similar to the FSSC-AM (Burnham & Lomax, in press-a, in press-b); and (d) fear items on the FSSC-AM will discriminate between ethnicity for gifted boys and girls aged 7–10, similar to the findings of Burnham and Lomax (in press-b).

Method

Participants

Two hundred eighty-seven gifted children participated in this study (i.e., 172 females; 115 males). This research utilized a convenience sample. The racial breakdown was as follows: 73.9% White ($n = 212$), 23.7% Black, ($n = 68$), 0.7% Hispanic ($n = 2$), 0.7% Asian ($n = 2$), and 1.0% American Indian ($n = 3$). Children between ages 7–10 participated in the study. The age breakdown was as follows: 7 years ($n = 12$), 8 years ($n = 76$), 9 years ($n = 98$), and 10 years ($n = 101$). Specific recruiting methods are described in the Procedure section.

Instrument

This study used the FSSC-AM (Burnham, 1995) for data collection. The FSSC-AM is a self-report measure of fear among children and adolescents aged 7–18 and has demonstrated high internal consistency throughout its development and use with varying populations (Burnham & Gullone, 1997; Gullone, Cummins, & King, 1996; Gullone & King, 1992, 1993). The FSSC-AM was adapted from the Australian FSSC-II (Gullone & King, 1992, 1993) and modified for use with American children; Burnham (1995, 2005) added 20 contemporary fear additions (e.g., “being raped,” “terrorist attacks”) and renamed the instrument the FSSC-AM. Burnham and Gullone (1997) found that the factor structure for the FSSC-II when administered to American youth closely resembled the factor structure reported for Australian youth.

The FSSC-AM contains 98 items (i.e., 3 items are omitted for children in the second through sixth grades. The omitted items are “being raped,” “getting pregnant,” and “voodoo/satanic cults”). The fear items are rated on a 3-point scale (i.e., 1 = *not scared*, 2 = *scared*, and 3 = *very scared*). The FSSC-AM is read aloud to children in the second and third grades. The instrument takes approximately 15–30 minutes to administer, depending on the age and reading level of the students.

Procedure

Data collection and examination of variables followed the procedures of Gullone and King (1992, 1993). After Institutional Review Board (IRB) approval, three school systems agreed to participate in the study. To determine if students met the gifted criteria, follow-up phone calls were made to the three school systems that agreed to participate. Phone conversations between the researcher and the special education coordinator involved discussing the logistics for the administration of the FSSC-AM, directions for contacting participants, and arranging a convenient time for the researcher to complete the study. Parental informed consents were sent home with the students who were identified as gifted by their respective school systems.

For the purpose of this study, the definition for *gifted* was as follows. Giftedness, as defined by the state in which this study was conducted, was determined by an eligibility committee that considered two pathways for qualification for the gifted program. The first pathway automatically determined a student to be eligible for gifted services if the composite score obtained on an intelligence test administered by a licensed practitioner was 130 or above or the score obtained on the Torrance Tests of Creative Thinking was at or above the 97th national percentile. The second pathway used to determine eligibility included reviewing a combination of aptitude, achievement, and personality characteristics associated with giftedness. Appendix A presents the worksheet and the point chart used to identify students through the second pathway. The worksheet was used to assign points ranging from 0 to 5 in (a) aptitude on an individual or group test of intelligence or creativity; (b) gifted behaviors from a behavioral rating scale measuring personality characteristics associated with giftedness as completed by a classroom teacher; and (c) three indicators of achievement at the gifted level (i.e., test scores, grades, work samples, portfolios demonstrating leadership or motivation). If a student earned a total score of 17 points or greater on the combination of aptitude, personality characteristics, and achievement, he or she was determined to be eligible for gifted services.

After arranging a convenient time and date with the gifted teacher at the three respective school systems, the researcher administered the FSSC-AM in a group setting during the time set for gifted

instruction. Prior to administration of the FSSC-AM, each gifted student returned the signed parent informed consent and assented to be a participant. The assent form provided the participants with the opportunity to write “yes” if they were willing to participate and “no” if they chose to decline. All eligible gifted children chose to participate in the study. Data were collected by the researcher and the classroom teacher. The children were directed to read each item on the FSSC-AM and to place a check mark or “x” in front of the word that most adequately described their level of fear (*not scared, scared, very scared*). The researcher emphasized that there were no right or wrong answers on the FSSC-AM and that the students should not be concerned about other participants’ responses. The FSSC-AM was read aloud to students in grades 2–3; older students worked independently. The researcher assisted with all questions by participants as they arose.

Data Analysis

This study design was *ex post facto*, utilizing the FSSC-AM. The present study was designed to investigate the fears of gifted children, ages 7–10. The independent variables were gender and ethnicity. The dependent variable, fear, was measured by the FSSC-AM. *A priori* discriminant analyses were used to assess factor scores and fear items that differentiated gender and ethnicity of gifted children.

Sample size determination for discriminant analysis was based on work done by Stevens (1999) and Huberty (1994). Stevens suggested 20 subjects per group for discriminant analysis. Huberty recommended the minimum number of people in the smallest group to be at least five times the number of predictors. Based on research (Burnham, 2005; Burnham & Giesen, 2005; Gullone & King, 1993; Ollendick, 1983), a factor structure ranging from four to six factors was expected. Therefore, a sample size ranging from 80–150 was determined to be sufficient for this study. However, power and robustness were increased with a larger sample size.

A principal component analysis determined the same best-fit factor structure for gifted children ages 7–10 as Burnham (2005) found for elementary school children. Determining conditions for the principal component analysis included a scree plot and eigenvalue greater

than 1 criterion. Principal component analysis was run with four-, five-, and six- factor solutions using both oblimin and varimax rotations and based on results of past studies. On the basis of conceptual fit, interpretability, and previous studies (Burnham, 2005; Gullone & King, 1993), the five-factor solution was retained. The principal component analysis accounted for 42.77% of the total explained variance. The five factors that emerged in this study were: (a) Fear of Death and Danger, (b) Fear of the Unknown, (c) School/Social Stress Fears, (d) Animal Fears, and (e) Medical-Scary Fears.

Results

Gender Differences

A priori discriminant analysis was used to investigate which factor scores discriminated between boys and girls, regardless of ethnicity. The discriminant function analysis for gender as a variable, Wilks' lambda (95) = 0.79, $p = .000$, correctly classified 72.1% of the cases: 70.1% of the boys and 75.0% of the girls were classified correctly. The expected hit ratio, or the percent that would have been correctly classified by chance alone, was 41% for the boys and 59% for the girls. Two factor scores emerged discerning significant differences between the gifted boys and girls. Comparing the cutoff score of .46 to the standardized canonical discriminant function coefficients resulted in two factor scores differentiating between gifted boys and girls: Fear of Death and Danger ($M = .66$) and Animal Fears ($M = .76$).

Item analysis was conducted to determine which specific fear items contributed to the factor differences. Within the Fear of Death and Danger factor, six fear items were found to differentiate between gifted boys and girls. Girls obtained higher mean scores on the following items: "strangers" (girls' $M = 2.20$; boys' $M = 1.68$), "shootings" (girls' $M = 2.63$; boys' $M = 2.12$), "having to fight in a war" (girls' $M = 2.66$; boys' $M = 2.22$), "riots" (girls' $M = 2.13$; boys' $M = 1.93$), "being threatened with a gun" (girls' $M = 2.82$; boys' $M = 1.96$), and "gangs" (girls' $M = 2.15$; boys' $M = 1.67$). For Animal Fears, "rats" (girls' $M = 1.85$; boys' $M = 1.21$) and "snakes" (girls' $M =$

2.24; boys' $M = 1.59$) were found to differentiate between fears of gifted boys and girls.

Ethnicity

A priori discriminant analysis was used to determine which factors differentiated between Black and White gifted children aged 7–10 (see Table 1). Not enough data were collected to analyze differences among other ethnicities. Approximately 79.4% of the cases were correctly classified, Wilks' lambda (95) = .80, $p = .000$. These results were based on an analysis set that was not balanced in terms of numbers of participants of each race (White children = 135; Black children = 15). Further, the Black children in this study were recruited from schools with populations receiving high percentages of reduced or free lunch (80–95%), indicating low-SES status. Therefore, these results may not have correctly identified differentiating factors. The expected hit ratio, or the percent of children who would have had their ethnicity correctly classified by chance alone, was 76% for the White children and 24% for the Black children.

Nonetheless, the same factor scores that differentiated between genders (i.e., Fear of Death and Danger and Animal Fears) also differentiated between the Black and White gifted children. Item analysis was used to determine which fear items within these factor scores contributed to significant differences between the Black and White children. The item analysis revealed that within the Fear of Death and Danger factor, fear items contributing to differences between White and Black children included "strangers," "my parents separating or getting divorced," "getting an electric shock," "being in a fight," "myself dying," and "getting lost in a crowd." Within Animal Fears, item analysis also revealed specific fear items contributing to differences between Black and White children. The items were "rats," "tigers," and "lizards." The researcher has to assume that the significant differences found could be confounded. This is speculated because the significant differences also could be related to SES as much as ethnicity in this study (i.e., most of the Black children were from schools associated with low SES).

Table 1
Items Discriminating Between Ethnicities
on the FSSC-AM

Fear of Death and Danger	<i>M</i> (Black children)	<i>M</i> (White children)
Strangers	2.29	1.90
My parents separating or getting divorced	1.95	2.23
Getting an electric shock	2.59	2.19
Being in a fight	1.56	1.74
Myself dying	2.86	2.47
Getting lost in a crowd	2.02	2.06
Animal Fears	<i>M</i> (Black children)	<i>M</i> (White children)
Rats	1.94	1.50
Tigers	2.06	1.68
Lizards	1.42	1.13

Discussion

In an effort to provide new insight into the normal developmental fear patterns in gifted children, this study utilized contemporary research on the social and emotional development of gifted children using a modern fear survey. Gifted children have been shown to be different than their peers in social and emotional development. For example, they may be at a higher risk for anxiety and depression because of attributes such as asynchronous developmental patterns, perfectionism, and early moral concern (Hébert & Speirs Neumeister, 2003; Piechowski, 1991). Gifted children may downplay their interests and gifts in an effort to fit in or avoid feeling different from their peers (Webb et al., 2007). This research used discriminant analysis, which revealed differences in factor scores and fear items relating to gender and ethnicity in elementary gifted children.

The first and second hypotheses explored which factor scores and fear items on the FSSC-AM discriminated between gender for gifted boys and girls aged 7–10. Two factors emerged discerning differences between the gifted boys and girls. The findings in this study were consistent with Gullone and King (1993) in that the discriminating factors related to death and danger and animals, and girls obtained

higher mean scores on all fear items. The authors, similar to Ginsburg and Silverman (2000) and Gullone and King (1993), postulate that the gender differences are related, at least to a degree, to societal expectations for girls and boys. Items analysis was generated to assess which fear items within the statistically significant fear factors best discriminated between gifted boys and girls aged 7–10. Within the Fear of Death and Danger factor, six items were found to differentiate between gifted boys and girls: “strangers,” “shootings,” “having to fight in a war,” “riots,” “being threatened with a gun,” and “gangs.” For Animal Fears, “rats” and “snakes” were found to differentiate between fears of gifted boys and girls aged 7–10. Again, Gullone and King (1993) found that the items that most strongly discriminated between boys and girls included “rats,” “spiders,” “snakes,” “mice,” “creepy houses,” “being alone,” and “having bad dreams.” The results in this study also paralleled older fear research that found boys to be more fearful of harm, bodily injury, school failure, nightmares, and imaginary creatures (Bamber, 1974, 1979; Cummings, 1944; Jersild & Holmes, 1935a; Jersild et al., 1933; Lapouse & Monk, 1959; Poznanski, 1973; Winker, 1949), adding further support to the consistency in findings.

It is noteworthy that four of the six items that differentiated between gifted boys and girls on the FSSC-AM were contemporary items Burnham (2005) added to the American version of the FSSC-II. Thus, four fears in this study were unique when compared to Gullone and King (1993). The four contemporary items were (a) “having to fight in war,” (b) “gangs,” (c) “shootings,” and (d) “riots.” The authors put forward the claim that the contemporary endorsements of the new items may relate to the societal changes and the climate of terror that youth face today. Certainly, gifted children could have a better grasp of the political and social climates than some of their peers.

The third and fourth hypotheses examined which factor scores on the FSSC-AM discriminated between ethnicity for gifted boys and girls aged 7–10. Black participants were predominantly from schools associated with low SES. Therefore, results are confounded and can only be speculative. Comparing the cutoff score of .46 to the standardized canonical discriminant function coefficients, the same factors that differentiated between genders, Fear of Death and Danger

and Animal Fears, were found to differentiate between the Black and White gifted children. These results were consistent with findings by Burnham and Lomax (in press-a, in press-b), which indicated Black children had significantly higher fear endorsements related to Animal Fears than White children. However, contrary to the study by Burnham and Lomax (in press-a) in which school and family-related fears also differentiated between Black and White children, the second differentiating factor in this study included the Fear of Death and Danger. In this study, the discriminating items included in the Death and Danger factor may suggest children from a lower SES background exhibit more concrete fears (Angelino et al., 1956; Bamber, 1974; Jersild & Holmes, 1935a; Jersild et al., 1933; Nalven, 1970). The item analysis exploring ethnicity effects revealed that within the Fear of Death and Danger factor, six items contributed to differences: "strangers," "my parents separating or getting divorced," "getting an electric shock," "being in a fight," "myself dying," and "getting lost in a crowd." Within Animal Fears, item analysis revealed three items contributed to differences between Black and White children. They were: "rats," "tigers," and "lizards."

Because research indicates gifted children exhibit developmental differences relative to their peers, it is important to determine how these children respond to fears in comparison to nongifted children in an effort to better understand and serve gifted children in school and community settings. Comparison was difficult in this study due to the paucity of research involving the fears of gifted children. This research offers a starting point. Further research is necessary to see if results are duplicated and can be generalized to larger populations.

Limitations

There were limitations to this study. Because the participants were from two regions in one state, geographic limitations make generalizability difficult. Second, the definition of giftedness is defined by varying standards in different school systems. Also, while research on gifted children offers much-needed insight, few comparisons could be made due to the lack of previous research (i.e., four previous studies). Finally, ethnicity differences were difficult to analyze because most of the Black children were from low-SES communi-

ties, which as previously mentioned, appeared to confound analysis. Needed comparisons between gifted and nongifted students could not be done with this study.

Recommendations for Future Research

This study sought to take a first step in developing contemporary normative data with gifted children. With new data, gifted children's fears can be compared more accurately to the fears of the general student population. Additional research focusing on frequency of fears among gifted children also will help to differentiate what is "normal" for this population.

Challenges remain in researching gifted children. This research included children only from two geographic regions in one state. Future research should include children from other regions of the U.S. to determine if the results can be generalized. Research also should attempt to collect data from more racially diverse groups. Additionally, research should be expanded to include children aged 11–18 to further investigate differences of gifted children in relation to their peers. Comparisons between gifted children and their peers would increase the understanding of differences for professionals who work with gifted children. Finally, children from urban, suburban, and rural locations should be considered.

References

- Adderholdt-Elliott, M. (1999). *Perfectionism: What's so bad about being too good?* Minneapolis, MN: Free Spirit.
- Angelino, H., Dollins, J., & Mech, E. V. (1956). Trends in the "fears and worries" of school children as related to SES and age. *Journal of Genetic Psychology, 89*, 263–276.
- Bamber, J. H. (1974). The fears of adolescents. *Journal of Genetic Psychology, 125*, 127–140.
- Bamber, J. H. (1979). *The fears of adolescents*. London: Academic Press.

- Burnham, J. J. (1995). *Validation of the Fear Survey Schedule for Children and Adolescents (FSSC-II) in the United States*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Auburn University.
- Burnham, J. J. (2005). Fears of children in the United States: An examination of the American Fear Survey Schedule with 20 new contemporary fear items. *Measurement and Evaluation in Counseling and Development, 38*, 78–91.
- Burnham, J. J., & Giesen, J. (2005). The American Fear Survey Schedule for Children (FSSC-AM): A confirmatory factors analysis with elementary, middle, and high school students. *Research in the Schools, 12*, 89–95.
- Burnham, J. J., & Gullone, E. (1997). The Fear Survey Schedule for Children-II: A psychometric investigation with American data. *Behaviour Research and Therapy, 35*, 165–173.
- Burnham, J., & Lomax, R. (in press-a). Examining ethnicity and fears of children and adolescents in the United States: Differences between Caucasian, African American, and Hispanic populations. *Journal of Counseling and Development*.
- Burnham, J., & Lomax, R. (in press-b). Investigating fears: Gender, age, and race/ethnicity differences among children and adolescents. *Journal of Counseling and Development*.
- Cooley-Quille, M., Boyd, R., Frantz, E., & Walsh, J. (2001). Data trends: Emotional and behavioral impact of exposure to community violence in inner-city adolescents. *Journal of Clinical Child Psychology, 30*, 199–206.
- Croake, J. W. (1969). Fears of children. *Human Development, 12*, 239–247.
- Cummings, J. D. (1944). The incidence of emotional symptoms in school children. *British Journal of Educational Psychology, 14*, 163–177.
- Dong, Q., Yang, B., & Ollendick, T. H. (1994). Fears in Chinese children and adolescents and their relations to anxiety and depression. *Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry and Allied Disciplines, 35*, 351–363.
- Erol, N., & Sahin, N. (1995). Fears of children and the cultural context: The Turkish norms. *European Child and Adolescent Psychiatry, 4*, 85–93.

- Ginsburg, G., & Silverman, W. (2000). Gender role orientation and fearfulness in children with anxiety disorders. *Journal of Anxiety Disorders, 14*, 57–67.
- Graziano, A. M., DeGiovanni, I. S., & Garcia, K. A. (1979). Behavioral treatment of children's fears: A review. *Psychological Bulletin, 86*, 804–830.
- Gross, M. (1993). *Exceptionally gifted children*. London: Routledge.
- Gullone, E., Cummins, R., & King, N. J. (1996). Self-reported fears: A comparison study of youths with and without an intellectual disability. *Journal of Intellectual Disability Research, 40*, 227–240.
- Gullone, E., & King, N. J. (1992). Psychometric evaluation of a revised Fear Survey Schedule for Children and Adolescents. *Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry and Allied Disciplines, 33*, 987–998.
- Gullone, E., & King, N. J. (1993). The fears of youth in the 1990s: Contemporary normative data. *Journal of Genetic Psychology, 154*, 137–153.
- Gullone, E., & King, N. J. (1997). Three-year follow-up of normal fear in children and adolescents aged 7–18 years. *British Journal of Developmental Psychology, 15*, 97–111.
- Hébert, T., & Speirs Neumeister, K. L. (2003). Fostering the social and emotional development of gifted children through guided viewing of film. *Roeper Review, 25*, 17–21.
- Huberty, C. (1994). *Applied discriminant analysis*. New York: John Wiley & Sons.
- Jersild, A. T., & Holmes, F. B. (1935a). *Children's fears*. New York: Columbia University, Teacher's College.
- Jersild, A. T., & Holmes, F. B. (1935b). Some factors in the development of children's fears. *Journal of Experimental Education, 4*, 133–141.
- Jersild, A. T., Markey, F. V., & Jersild, C. L. (1933). *Children's fears, dreams, wishes, daydreams, likes, dislikes, pleasant, and unpleasant memories* (Child Development Monographs Vol. 12). New York: Columbia University Press.
- King, N. J., Mulhall, J., & Gullone, E. (1989). Fears in hearing-impaired and normally hearing children and adolescents. *Behavioral Research and Therapy, 27*, 577–580.

- Lapouse, R., & Monk, M. A. (1959). Fears and worries in a representative sample of children. *American Journal of Orthopsychiatry*, 29, 803–818.
- Maurer, A. (1965). What children fear. *Journal of Genetic Psychology*, 106, 265–277.
- Nalven, F. B. (1970). Manifest fears and worries of ghetto vs. middle-class suburban children. *Psychological Reports*, 27, 285–286.
- Neihart, M., Reis, S. M., Robinson, N. M., & Moon, S. M. (2002). *The social and emotional development of gifted children: What do we know?* Waco, TX: Prufrock Press.
- Ollendick, T. H. (1983). Reliability and validity of the revised Fear Survey Schedule for Children (FSSC-R). *Behaviour Research and Therapy*, 21, 685–692.
- Ollendick, T. H., King, N., & Frary, R. (1989). Fears in children and adolescents: Reliability and generalizability across gender, age and nationality. *Behaviour Research and Therapy*, 27, 19–26.
- Ollendick, T. H., Matson, J. L., & Helsel, W. J. (1985). Fears in children and adolescents: Normative data. *Behavioral Research and Therapy*, 23, 465–467.
- Ollendick, T. H., Yang, B., Dong, Q., Xia, Y., & Lin, L. (1995). Perceptions of fear in other children and adolescents: The role of gender and friendship status. *Journal of Abnormal Child Psychology*, 23, 439–452.
- Ollendick, T. H., Yang, B., King, N., Dong, Q., & Akande, A. (1996). Fears in American, Australian, Chinese, and Nigerian children and adolescents: A cross-cultural study. *Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry and Allied Disciplines*, 37, 213–220.
- Piechowski, M. M. (1991). Emotional development and emotional giftedness. In N. Colangelo & G. Davis (Eds.), *Handbook of gifted education* (pp. 285–306). Needham Heights, MA: Allyn & Bacon.
- Powell, P. M., & Haden, T. (1984). The intellectual and psychosocial nature of extreme giftedness. *Roeper Review*, 6, 131–133.
- Poznanski, E. O. (1973). Children with excessive fears. *American Journal of Orthopsychiatry*, 43, 428–429.
- Pratt, K. C. (1945). A study of the “fears” of rural children. *Journal of Genetic Psychology*, 67, 179–194.

- Scherer, M. W., & Nakamura, C. Y. (1968). A Fear Survey for Children (FSS-FC): A factor analytic comparison with manifest anxiety (CMAS). *Behaviour Research and Therapy*, 6, 173–182.
- Shore, G., & Rapport, M. (1998). The Fear Survey Schedule for Children-Revised (FSSC-R): Ethnocultural variations in children's fearfulness. *Journal of Anxiety Disorders*, 12, 437–461.
- Sidana, U. R. (1967). Socio-economic status of family and fear in children. *Journal of Psychological Research*, 11, 1–6.
- Silverman, L. K. (1995). Highly gifted children. In J. L. Genshaft, M. Birely, & C. L. Hollinger (Eds.), *Serving gifted and talented students: A resource for school personnel* (pp. 217–240). Austin, TX: Pro-Ed.
- Stevens, J. (1999). *Applied multivariate statistics for the social sciences* (3rd ed.). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Stevenson, J., Batten, N., & Cherner, M. (1992). Fears and fearfulness in children and adolescents: A genetic analysis of twin data. *Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry and Allied Disciplines*, 33, 977–985.
- Webb, J. T., & Kleine, P. A. (1993). Assessing gifted and talented children. In J. Culbertson and D. Willis (Eds.), *Testing young children* (pp. 383–407). Austin, TX: Pro-Ed.
- Webb, J. T., Gore, J. L., Amend, E. R., & DeVries, A. R. (2007). *A parent's guide to gifted children*. Scottsdale, AZ: Great Potential Press.
- Whitmore, J. R., & Maker, C. J. (1985). *Intellectual giftedness in disabled persons*. Rockville, MD: Aspen.
- Winker, J. B. (1949). Age trends and sex differences in the wishes, identification, activities, and fears of children. *Child Development*, 20, 191–200.
- Wolman, B. (1978). *Children's fears*. New York: Grosset and Dunlap.

Author Note

Correspondence should be addressed to Dr. Jacalyn G. Tippey, 8739 Inverness Place, Tuscaloosa, AL 35405; jtippey@gmail.com.

Appendix A

Screening Form for Identifying Gifted Children via Aptitude, Student Achievement, and Personality Scores

GIFTED ELIGIBILITY/SCREENING DETERMINATION FORM

Name: _____ School System: _____ Social Security Number: _____ Race: _____

Section I: Automatic Eligibility		Aptitude Tests Administered										
A student is automatically eligible if the total/composite score on an aptitude test (required to be administered by a psychologist) is 130+, or the national percentile score of the Torrance Test of Creative Thinking is at or above the 97th national percentile. Test Administered: _____ Score: _____		TESTS ADMINISTERED	S1	S2	S3	S4	S5	S6	S7	S8	S9	S10
APPTITUDE		POINTS EARNED	129+ - 127	126-124	123-121	120-118	117-115	114-112	111-109	108-106	105-103	
CHARACTERISTICS Any subscale score may be used	Instrument: _____ Subscale: _____	SCORE	145+	144-141	140-137	136-133	132-129	128-125	124-121	120-117	116-113	
PERFORMANCE *Point Conversion Chart: Points Earned = Rounded Points 15 = _____ 14 = _____ 13 = _____ 12 = _____ 11 = _____ 10 = _____ 09 = _____ 08 = _____ 07 = _____ 06 = _____ 05 = _____ 04 = _____	INDICATORS If behavior rating scale scores are used enter no more than 2. Choose any scores except Intellectual and Achievement	POINTS	96-5% ^{ale}	94-2% ^{ale}	91-0% ^{ale}	89-7% ^{ale}	86-5% ^{ale}	83-1% ^{ale}	80-0% ^{ale}	77-0% ^{ale}	74-0% ^{ale}	
		Rounded Points:*	15+	14	13	12	11	10	9	8	7	
		TOTAL POINTS EARNED	CHARACTERISTICS	GATES	RENZULLI TABS	ACHIEVEMENT	Total Reading, Math, Science, Language, Social Studies, or Total Battery.					
		points earned:*	Hawthorne (GES)	Local	National	must be used	90-88 scores					
Referral Source: _____ Referral Date: _____ YES _____ NO _____ For systems that screen only		Date of Eligibility Meeting: _____ (Do not use this box for Screening. Return to Referral form to sign and date.) Signatures of Team Members _____ (Three signatures required)										
SCREENING DECISION _____ YES _____ NO _____ For systems that screen only		ELIGIBILITY DECISION _____ YES _____ NO _____ (Student is eligible with a total of 17 points OR by meeting Automatic Eligibility criteria. A student may not be determined ineligible with an aptitude assessment that is considered a screener)										