

July 28th, 2015

Prof. Heidrun Stoeger—Editor
High Ability Studies

Dear Prof. Stoeger,

Thank you for the opportunity to revise and resubmit my paper entitled: "A comparison of multiple facets of self-concept in gifted vs. non-identified Israeli students" for future consideration for publication in the special issue of *High Ability Studies*.

I thank the reviewer(s) for the constructive comments and suggestions for revision. Following these recommendations, I made the following changes and revisions. Regarding each point made by the reviewer(s), *formatted in italics*, I provided my response, following 'Author.'

General Points

1. Language: Throughout the manuscript I would shorten/divide the sentences: e.g. p. 3: The first 3 sentences cover more than half of the page.

Author: I have carefully reviewed the entire manuscript and in the tradition of my forefathers, 'circumcised' and chopped off parts of especially long sentences...

Theoretical Framework and Research question

2. Abstract: Using "profile" without explanation sounds like a person oriented approach (e.g. latent class analysis) instead only the mean profiles were compared with MANOVA procedures.

Author: I corrected this sentence to currently read 'mean self-concept score profiles' and added 'mean' to description of self-concept score differences.

3. p.3. The first sentence needs a reference.

Author: Reference (Zinovich & Zeidner) provided.

4. Wording issues: p.3. What is a personal profile? What is the difference between emotional and psychological health?

10. I would abstain from using phrases like: p.4. "The debate goes on and the jury is still out regarding the final results" or Abstract: "This paper hopes to fill a gap..."

Author: These unhappy phrases were deleted....

11. p.10-11. I would like to have more information about the sample (e.g. number of classes, number of schools, ...).

Author: I provided more information about the sample on p. 11, noting that " Data were collected from 802 Israeli adolescents (53.2% male), studying in a total of 34 classrooms in 9 high-schools throughout Israel. Students were enrolled grades 10 ($n = 218$, 27.2%), 11 ($n = 380$, 47.4%), and 12 ($n = 204$, 25.4%).

.12. p.11. Does "heterogeneous" classes mean that gifted and non-identified students are together?

Author: On p. 11, I clarified that gifted participants were enrolled in special programs for gifted or talented students, including both homogeneous gifted classes or 'pull out' programs in heterogeneous classes, where both non-identified and identified student study together..

13. p.11. Matching: How was the matching done exactly? What does "attempts" mean?

Author: As noted on pp. 11-12, based on a roster of all high schools in Israel offering special classes for the gifted provided by the Ministry of Education in Israel ($k = 10$ such schools), we randomly sampled four high-schools situated in Northern and Central Israel offering special homogeneous classes for gifted students. Within each of these four schools we assessed all 10th through 12th grade students enrolled in gifted classes. Furthermore, within each of these schools, we assessed available students in grades 10 through 12 who were enrolled in heterogeneous classes. These heterogeneous classes included both non-identified and identified students, who participated in this study.

In order to further identify gifted students in regular heterogeneous classes, along with comparable non-selected counterparts, we proceeded as follows. Based on available administrative data, we rank ordered the remaining high schools in Israeli (not offering special classes for the gifted) by socioeconomic level and student achievement. We randomly sampled five schools in the top quartile of high schools on the roster. Within these schools, we assessed students in available 10 through 12 grade classes, thus enabling us to assess both identified students in pull-out programs and non-identified students for this study.

Author: On p. 13, we clarified that in matrix terminology a set of means is called a vector variable (see Heck and Thomas, 2015, p. 11).

20. *Table 1: what is meant by “d”? The effect size d?*

Please provide also an interpretation of this estimate. What do you consider a small, medium or high?

Author: Indeed, the *d* score is an effect size estimate of mean differences in SD units. Based on Cohen (1988), *ds* of .20, .50, and .80, are, rather broadly, considered small, medium, or high size, respectively. This information was included in the footnote to Table 1.

21. *p.15-16. “However, our data cannot shed light on the direction of the relationship between academic self-concept and scholastic achievement causal relationship, as it is likely that self-concept both enhances and is enhanced by academic successes in various areas.”* ☐
This needs a reference (see e.g. Marsh & Martin, 2011)

Author: Reference to Marsh and Martin (2011) and their reciprocal effect model provided on p. 16.

22. *p. 17. “As for moral self-concept, this study is one of the first modern studies to empirically ...” What does “modern” mean?*

Author: We changed modern to ' recent...'

...23. *P.18. I don't think a “clinical interview” is a good instrument to measure self-concept*

Author: We removed the clinical interview suggestion.

Minor points/typos:

Author: All typos corrected

We hope the revised manuscript is more compelling and will be acceptable for publication in the journal. We look forward to your editorial feedback

Sincerely,

Moshe Zeidner
Prof. of Educational Psychology and Human Development.