

# Comparison of Personality Traits in Gifted Students with the Highest and Lowest Levels of Creativity

Pardis. Tabatabaei Irani<sup>1</sup> , Gholam. Ali Afrooz<sup>2\*</sup> , Sayed. Saeed Sajjadi Anari<sup>3</sup> 


1. Campus Master of Science in General Psychology, Kish International Campus, University of Tehran, Tehran, Iran

2. Professor, Department of Psychology, University of Tehran, Tehran, Iran



3. Assistant Professor, Department of Psychology and Education of Exceptional Children, University of Tehran, Tehran, Iran

\* Corresponding author email address: Afrooz@ut.ac.ir

## E d i t o r

Gholamreza Rajabi   
Professor of Counseling  
Department, Shahid Chamran  
University, Ahvaz, Iran  
rajabireza@scu.ac.ir

## R e v i e w e r s

**Reviewer 1:** Sara Nejatifar   
Department of Psychology and Education of People with Special Needs, Faculty of  
Educational Sciences and Psychology, University of Isfahan, Isfahan, Iran.  
Email: s.nejatifar@edu.ui.ac.ir  
**Reviewer 2:** Kamdin. Parsakia   
Department of Psychology and Counseling, KMAN Research Institute, Richmond  
Hill, Ontario, Canada. Email: kamdinarsakia@kmanresce.ca

## 1. Round 1

### 1.1. Reviewer 1

Reviewer:

In the paragraph beginning “Giftedness has long been conceptualized as a multidimensional construct...”, the manuscript references contemporary models but does not clearly name or briefly outline a specific guiding framework (e.g., developmental, transformational, or personality-based models). Explicit identification would improve conceptual grounding.

While validity and reliability are discussed historically, the manuscript does not report internal consistency coefficients calculated in the current sample. Please report Cronbach’s alpha (or equivalent) for this study’s data.

The Buss questionnaire is described as having four dimensions, yet later tables omit the “aggressive-oriented personality” dimension. Please clarify whether this subscale was excluded, and if so, provide a methodological justification.

The manuscript reports Levene’s test results but does not mention normality checks (e.g., skewness/kurtosis, Shapiro–Wilk). Please indicate how normality assumptions for t-tests were assessed.

In Table 1, the reported ranges (e.g., minimum 86 for high creativity) imply a strong separation between groups. Please clarify whether overlapping scores were excluded by design or whether this reflects natural clustering.

Authors uploaded the revised manuscript.

### 1.2. Reviewer 2

Reviewer:

The paragraph stating “substantial heterogeneity exists within gifted populations themselves” would benefit from a clear operational definition of what constitutes “high” versus “low” creativity in prior literature, to better situate the study’s grouping logic.

When discussing traits such as assertiveness and openness, the manuscript references general findings but does not explicitly justify the selection of Buss’s four traits over alternative models (e.g., Big Five). Please add a short rationale linking these traits to creativity theory.

In the paragraph beginning “Within the Iranian context, several studies have explored creativity...”, the manuscript reviews local studies but does not clearly explain how Iranian educational or cultural norms might shape personality–creativity relations differently from Western contexts. A brief contextualization is recommended.

The paragraph starting “Despite the growing body of literature, several gaps remain evident” is strong but could be improved by explicitly stating how the present study uniquely addresses all three listed gaps simultaneously, rather than implicitly.

The sentence “employed a causal–comparative research design” may be misleading. Since no causal inference is tested, please clarify that the design is *ex post facto* and non-causal, or justify the use of causal–comparative terminology more explicitly.

In the paragraph describing the population (485 students), it is unclear whether any exclusion criteria (e.g., incomplete responses, learning disorders) were applied. Please specify inclusion/exclusion criteria to enhance methodological transparency.

The sentence “participants were categorized into groups with the highest and lowest levels of creativity” requires clarification. Please specify cut-off criteria (e.g., percentile split, median split) and justify why this method was chosen over continuous analysis.

Authors uploaded the revised manuscript.

## 2. Revised

Editor’s decision after revisions: Accepted.

Editor in Chief’s decision: Accepted.