

Teaching Gifted Students: The Psychodrama-Based Tutorial Alternative

Dr. Philippe Mouillot

University of Poitiers - IAE School of Management

20, Rue Guillaume VII Le Troubadour, 86000 Poitiers, France

pmouillot@poitiers.iae-france.fr

Abstract: Theories about giftedness conflict. Some pretend that such brains outstandingly perform whereas others defend the opposite: gifted people would fail, sometimes willingly, because of maladjustment to systems that do not fit their intellectual greed and mental differences. This research consists in investigating psychodrama as an experiential teaching solution to help talented students reveal their riches when experiential education rarely complies with an academic tradition, as it is the case in France. Despite obvious replication limits, a psychodrama-based learning experience proves to be both a valuable asset and a first milestone on the path to increasing gifted student's self esteem when acceleration and in-depth options fall short.

Keywords: Intelligence; Giftedness; Psychodrama; Higher Education.

*“The greatest good you can do for another is not just share your riches,
but to reveal to him his own.” Benjamin Disraeli*

Introduction

Alongside providing students with specific skills, a business school also has a role to play in terms of integration and personal development (Jewell 2005; Krause *et al.* 2003). In the USA, there is a long tradition of applying the principles of experiential learning to management education (Boggs *et al.* 2007). There is also a movement among US educators to design learning experiences that challenge students to use higher levels of Bloom's learning taxonomy (*i.e.* evaluate, create, etc.). that do not rely on memorisation (Anderson and Krathwohl 2001). Borredon *et al.* (2011). indicate that such approaches seem to be rare in France. In the US, a tradition of experiential learning (Gallos 2008; Kolb and Kolb 2009). has been an effective teaching methodology to help business students learn specific content and/or skills by actively experimenting with them in well-designed classroom activities. Experiential learning activities may also aim at developing the kinds of subjective and emotional outcomes that student at risk have to cope with (Gallos 2009; Mockler 2002; Schmidt-Wilk 2010). Yet, France does not have such an academic tradition: although hard sciences surely are experiential, the French higher education system mainly relies on lectures. The latter is certainly essential in terms of knowledge transmission but education requires more and more practice alongside theory for students to be able to perform once awarded their degree (Diezmann and Watters 2006), especially in business fields. Beside the French academic tradition's rigidity, a second issue arises: the case of gifted students.

If literature is replete with documentation about gifted people who do not find their place in the society, articles dealing with solutions to support gifted students' integration and personal development are scarce, especially in the French lecturing academic perspective.

Investigating an experiential teaching solution borrowed to psychology to help French talented students reveal their riches in a country where experiential education does not comply with the academic culture then proves to be highly relevant in order to cope with the needs of such an old knowledge-based economy. The instructor's role then needs to be enhanced with specific workshops (Kesner 2005). because dealing with gifted students requires very specific skills.

The traits characterising abnormal intelligences do not summarise outstanding intellectual and emotional capabilities. Beyond performance lies a world of pain and suffering for which no solution has proven its full efficiency so far. Indeed, gifted people mostly self-cure their lifelong traumas through behavioural modification leading to performance limitation and eventually talent shelving. In this regard, alongside its natural role of knowledge development, a business school can also investigate its social responsibility in welcoming gifted students and guiding them on the path to both success and self-esteem.

The case of France is a good example of environments where education is a nationwide cultural trait; yet it lacks support for gifted learners: 70% of the children who are diagnosed as gifted at school do not enter higher education, while the remaining few perform averagely, shadowing their incredible talent in order to avoid any harmful critics from their surroundings. This problem was raised more than half a century ago with the publication of McClelland *et al.* (1958): their research pointed out the need to investigate non intelligence-based factors as a possible source of explanation for gifted students' academic failure (Clinkenbeard 2012).

Here, we investigate a new teaching and learning framework, which could contribute in developing the French business experiential education with a special attention given to gifted students. To do so, we borrow the psychological technique of psychodrama in order to apply it within a sociodrama perspective, with the objective to observe possible integration progress from a gifted subject in formal tutorial groups.

This contribution hopefully brings additional solutions to the existing efforts displayed to develop talents' education in France, and gives birth to a promising series of future experiments.

The Controversial Gifted Intelligence

Mensa's criteria leading to the existence of an abnormal intellect extract conclusions from a series of verbal and mathematical tests: Binet-Simon, Cattell, K.ABC, NEMI, Raven's Matrix, Stanford-Binet, WAIS, and WISC. Cuts vary from one test to another and from one country to another. Yet, Mensa commonly accepts Binet-Simon's IQ-132 - 2% of a country's population - as the entry score. In comparison, the French average 110, and everything below 70 corresponds to various degrees of mental pathologies, ranging from the Down's syndrome to multiple psychological disorders. Although the identification of a gifted person is the consequence of observing a series of characteristics that are recurrent - anger, isolation, stress, digressions, specific reasoning, multi-talent capabilities - giftedness remains a vague concept for most of the families and academics (Duckworth and Seligman 2005), despite traits and attitudes that are common across cultures such as motivation, memory, insight imagination, creativity, and reasoning (Frasier and Passow 1994; Tomlinson *et al.* 2004).

There are two reasons behind this lack of awareness: many still believe that giftedness is a marginal occurrence, and the characteristics that lead to its identification are extremely close to intellectual weakness indicators. In other words, mentally weak subjects and gifted subjects often look alike and develop similar behaviours, a fact that has been pointed out quite recently (Dumas 2002). Moreover, since humans are developing beings, giftedness is often mixed up with other disequilibria, the latter harming families' capability in suspecting such traits (Flynn 1987; Wicherts *et al.* 2004). Understanding a disorder's aetiology then means widening the tests' scope, considering individual, familial, and environmental factors that, all together, explain behaviour; this makes the task quite uncomfortable to perform and the end diagnosis rather uncertain.

Although gifted subjects neither suffer from the Asperger syndrome (Shore 2003), nor from any autistic pathology like the movie industry often presents it, their behaviours and performances can sometimes exhibit such specificities (Appleyard *et al.* 2005). For example, gifted people's degree of intelligence is so high that they do not find any interest in others' speech; consequently, they isolate and develop a mental life in their own world (Corbetta and Shulman 2002; Rimé 2005), a behaviour wrongly considered materialising autistic symptoms. During school years, those symptoms are reinforced because when confronted with learning challenges, gifted children feel bored and rarely get the explanations they seek. No one then really understands their greed for superior content at such a young age so they feel forsaken; in reaction, they decide to hide, *i.e.* perform like the average do, or merely fail in order to make sure someone will eventually care (Bradford and LeDuc 1975): at the end of the day, only 30% of the French children who have been diagnosed gifted at school would enter higher education.

Once an adult, gifted subjects still have to cope with the same exact circumstances and misunderstandings (Blackwell *et al.* 2007): unless diagnosed at early stages, gifted personalities either maintain a lifelong wandering behaviour or, in the worst cases, even develop mental pathologies such as bipolarity, schizophrenia, or paranoia (Bedart and Dhuey 2006; Dumet and Ménéchal 2005), thus joining the group of inborn intellectually weak people.

Semiology, Pathologies, Opposite Theses and Recurrent Academic Issues

Attempting to measure intelligence is certainly as challenging as controversial (Binet 1905; Kamin 1995; Nisbett *et al.* 2012; Pollack and Brenner 1969; Siegler 1992; Terman and Merrill 1960). This is mainly due to the high number of variables that are supposed to contribute to define intelligence, such as genetic inheritance, educational level, social environment, cultural influences, or the *g* factor (Spearman 1904), the central indicator all IQ tests relate to (Walton and Spencer 2009). and which explains 40 to 50% of the standard deviations that exist from one test result to another since intelligence is a combination of both general skills and more specific ones according to the task performed (Fischbein 1980).

The substantive ‘intelligence’ roots in the Latin word *intelligentare*, *i.e.* the faculty to understand; so intelligence is the group of mental functions that are capable of conceptualising and rationalising ideas. In a wider perspective, it is the tool that helps species adapt to circumstances according to the outcome of a prior analysis and evaluation of a given situation (Neisser *et al.* 1996), a concept clearly linked to Darwinism.

Intelligence divides into 8 distinctive categories (Colom *et al.* 2010; Gardner 1999; Goleman 2005; McGlone and Aronson 2006): lingual, mathematical, musical, spatial, kinesthesis, naturalist, interpersonal, and intrapersonal. Moreover, Horn and Cattell (1967) distinguish crystallised intelligence, $g(C)$, from fluid intelligence, $g(F)$, still balancing the results. In the first case, $g(C)$, the subject acts smartly thanks to stored knowledge and experience while, in the second case, $g(F)$, the subject is naturally able to fix issues and imagine creative solutions without using any specific knowledge or reminding previous similar situations' outcomes (Coyle and Pillow 2008; Cyrulnik and Duval 2006). 'Working memory' then distinguishes from 'pure intelligence': gifted people are purely intelligent, so they often succeed at school - $g(C)$ - and fail at university - $g(F)$.

As far as Gardner's 8 intelligences are concerned, they distinguish as follows: *lingual* consists of being able to find the best words and in building the right speech according to the nature of the receptor that is receiving the information; *mathematical* lies in the art of playing with numbers; *musical* allows singing in tune or playing various instruments without any specific solfeggio knowledge; *spatial* provides tools to find one's way without compass or instrument; *kinesthetic* concerns all activities requiring perfect body mastering, such as martial arts; *naturalist* distinguishes between sensitive and perceptive information, and makes the brain conclude correctly what senses conclude wrongly, *i.e.* optical illusions (Gentaz and Hatwell 2004; Guillaume 1979); *interpersonal* is based on empathy and on one's capability to understand others' nonverbal behaviour; and *intrapersonal* helps know oneself through introspection.

Although doubt exists about a global acceptance of a giftedness framework (Sternberg and Davidson 2005), while everyone holds one or several intelligences up to different levels, gifted people master all of them and at high levels of performance. So they are often rejected, firstly because they do more, better, and faster than anyone else does and in all fields; second because they regularly push further reflexions when people prefer stopping, thus creating embarrassing situations that can lead to anger, making the gifted people suspected of being bipolar; and third because since they are abnormally sensitive (*cf.* interpersonal intelligence), they can sometimes be scarily considered clairvoyant due to their high level of scanning and observation of every tiny detail of everything: as published in Forbes in 2010, gifted people are not only considered very smart but sometimes ‘Scary Smart’ (Karlgaard 2010; Kellet *al.* 2013). Giftedness nosography then mostly summarises into a loss of contact with others, a lack of consciousness of specificities, a trait of strangeness for others, improbable performances in all fields, and thymic disorders; the latter can lead to depression, maniac behaviours, anxiety, phobias, and of course, obsessive-compulsive disorders (OCD). Yet, there is a great deal of disagreement about definitions of intelligence and talent, making the approach of the gifted issue even more complex (Friedman 2007; Zakaria 2011). While many defend the idea that gifted subjects mainly tend to fail, others (Kellet *al.* 2013). consider that talented people reach the pinnacle in many organisations, should the latter be academic-based or business-oriented.

The literature regularly points out the fact that talented students abnormally perform in specific skills - most of the time in verbal and mathematical areas - and fall short in other intelligences - spatial evolution or arts (Wai *et al.* 2009). -, but that such issues do not stop them from eventually shining bright. Others (Kell *et al.*, 2013). question the real gifted nature if performance is limited to one or two out of the eight types of intelligence, whatever the realm of this performance.

As far as academic failure is concerned, cases are systematically explained through five main neuropsychological disorders (Fancher 1996): attention (Lezak *et al.* 2004), memory (Botez-Marquard and Boller 2005; Oberauer 2003), aphasia and alexia (Kail 2003; Lechevalier 1995), perception (Lechevalier *et al.* 1995), and apraxia (Boujon 2002). In other words, students mainly fail because of a lack of focus, a weak memorisation, a loss of control when in public or when expressing their ideas in writing, a difficulty to distinguish the marginal from the essential, and a struggle when putting theory into practice. All parents and teachers agree on this list of disorders as the cause of student's failure (Herrnstein *et al.* 1986; Kail and Fayol 2003).; but only few question the possibility of giftedness: effects are observed but causes are not questioned. Yet, gifted students actually fail due to similar reasons, except that, in their case, this behaviour is voluntary while in the case of weak students, it is undergone. Indeed, if we go back to the list of academic failure disorder sources, they all fit in the gifted characteristics.

- Focus: Gifted students do not listen in class because the topics covered are either not interesting enough or not demanding enough due to the presence of normal students in the classroom (Allport 1980; Carr 2004). Moreover, since they have a good memory, they often do not understand what they learn since they did not go through a learning-to-learn process because traditional teaching methods are not stimulating for them.
- Memory: Their excellent memory notwithstanding, they do not memorise what they consider useless, uninteresting, or easy, thus failing many exams.
- Expression: Although they feel comfortable and confident in public, they are sometimes hard to follow, either because they speak fast or because they write according to structures that are atypical or unconventional (Ramsden *et al.* 2011).

- Perception: Their brain works differently. They rarely take the same direction and path from a problem to a solution than the ones the majority chooses. Consequently, they end up reaching nowhere, making teachers consider they did not understand anything.
- Apraxia: They find some difficulties in working in organisations merely because they have to cope with the same exact situations as the ones they faced while studying (Le Ny 2005).

Consequently, in the case of gifted students, a business school certainly has a role to play in terms of their integration and personal development, especially in France where the teaching and learning tradition is quite far from an experiential approach like in the USA. As of today, the recurrent techniques that are in place to help gifted students summarise in acceleration and in-depth teaching (Park *et al.* 2013). In the first case, students follow the same path as traditional students but faster. For example, they acquire a 2 or 3-year knowledge in 1 year. In the second case, they keep the same pace but they are taught additional and more complex things through tailor-made programmes. Those solutions are interesting because they highlight two important issues: (1) gifted students have been identified as so, proving that a detection system exists and works, and (2) students' talent is used for what it is worth. Nevertheless, this is also where those solutions fall short: they do not address the psychological root despite few efforts highlighted in the literature (Clinkenbeard 2012); acceleration and in-depth approaches optimise an existing resource but without helping the student's social integration in the various formal groups s/he belongs to. Gifted students then have to cope with two options: either perform just like others do and live peacefully hidden but without using their outstanding capabilities, or going for the above options but then isolating themselves even more from their working and social groups (Lubinski 2009).

Intelligence should then not be the only experimental framework; other essential variables such as values and personalities should also be closely scrutinised in order to help gifted talents not only bloom but also sustainably remain (Ceci and Williams 2011; Judge *et al.* 2010; Lubinski and Benbow 2006; Su *et al.* 2009). Intelligence actually interacts with so many social science issues that research eventually proves abnormal capabilities merely better develop thanks to environmental support than from inborn talents (Renzulli 2006; Sternberg and Davidson 2005). Moreover, research clearly highlights that although gifted students naturally show higher levels of motivation than underachieving students, there is no significant discrepancies when measuring academic self-perception (Bandura 1982; McCoach and Siegle 2003; Schunk *et al.* 2008). Those elements confirm possibilities of a psychologically-based solution to help abnormal talents better perform and fulfil their needs, as summarised by Rogers (2007): daily activity change, regular opportunities to perform, acceleration and in-depth solutions to be available, meet and share with similar students, and tailor-made content. The literature then alternatively defends the idea that gifted students perform as expected or fail; yet, in both cases, two constants remain: (1) both talented and weak students develop similar traits, respectively on purpose and by default, and (2) business schools do not mobilise psychological tools to partner traditional acceleration and in-depth solutions so far.

Notwithstanding the old French academic lecturing tradition, the French government has recently been implementing a reform to give universities their full independence back. This opens the scope to new considerations such as benchmarking the US experiential teaching models in order to cope with a growing transnational competition. And among the numerous experiential learning possibilities, an approach based on the psychodrama deserves further investigation for the following reasons.

A Methodology Borrowed Psychology

A psychodrama is a behavioural psychotherapy (Becerril-Maillefert 2013). created in 1937 by American psychiatrist Jacob Levy Moreno, a technique later modified by French Anne Ancelin-Schützenberger, René Diatkine, Evelyne Kestemberg, and Serge Lebovici who would lead research in the field, mainly with the observation of children.

The psychodrama technique is a therapy consisting in the expression of one's emotions through a real or imaginary scenario played via dramatic theatricalisation. The objective is to make the subject, adult or child (Anzieu 2004), express his/her conflicts thanks to the presence and the roles played by others. Since unsolved psychological conflicts are unconscious, psychodramas help subjects open the way to the conflict source by being in control when deciding if the scenario is real or not, hopefully reaching catharsis (Calevoi *et al.* 2010). A crisis situation is then created on stage so that a solution can be brought. The leading therapist tries to identify what the subject suffers from through the observation of the crisis situation that has been created.

Psychodrama methodology consists of setting up actors around the patient, usually played by cotherapists, the whole being observed by the leading therapist. Ideally, the patient is invited to play with three women and three men. All are psychoanalysts but they do not participate in any way to the observation; they are only actors and they are confined in the role that the patient allocates them. Four phases structure the psychodrama (Leveton 2001).

During phase 1, the patient is invited to choose the situation to play; s/he discusses options with the leader, *i.e.* the analyst. Most of the time, the patient has an immediate thought of what s/he wants to play, making the analyst quickly grab the problem. For example, children would express a night terror; teenagers would deal with a problem of anger, and adults would think of sexual or professional issues. A patient failing to choose a game situation obviously suffers from a high level of censorship; in this case, the analyst asks the patient open questions to start up the process. This benevolent neutrality does not harm the game in any way. It is only a stimulus helping the patient cope with a first psychological barrier. Methodologically speaking, the psychodrama subject chooses his/her own character as well as the cotherapists' ones. The psychodrama takes place on a stage, which is possibly decorated according to the situation that has been chosen. Players are informed that touching each other should be strictly avoided in order to prevent any suggestion temptation and leave everyone's psyche focused on the exercise's purpose.

Phase 2 starts with the beginning of the play (Delaroche 2011): the patient works with his/her own subconscious but also with others' since what players communicate unconsciously is received by the subject who can adapt the scenario; the latter can then go through several stages of mutation. The leader observes the players performing but, opposite to classical theatre, they do not move that much due to the fact that touch is banned, thus leaving full space to verbalisation. The leader can also interfere in two cases. A redundant story is the first case: there, s/he tries to give a new orientation to the scenario, for example by bringing in someone new. The second case concerns slips, parapraxis, a speech that should not be there, or a game digression making the patient get out of his/her role and character. In such cases, the leader can either restart the game or even stop it.

Phase 3 marks the end of the psychodrama after a 1 to 3-hour session. In order to help the patient stop playing his/her role, dropping the curtain ends the game. A first indicator proves the psychodrama's success: the patient is surprised that the leader knew the exact moment for dropping the curtain.

Phase 4 consists in performing the analysis of the psychodrama. The analyst measures the deviation between what the patient had asked and what had eventually been played. The bigger the deviation, the thicker the patient's unconscious. In case of success, the patient realises his/her difficulties by observing the materialisation of his/her fears and problems (Lorin 2010).

An alternative to psychodrama is sociodrama (Goldsztaub 2009): the objective is similar but the decorum slightly changes: patients are minimum four and up to ten, and two analysts are there to observe the exchange, none of them leading the game. Each subject from the group would theoretically consciously or unconsciously try to find links between him/herself and others. The objective is still to identify personal conflicts but comfortably numb inside a group that represents a momentary reassuring psychic envelope.

Material and Method

Since psychodramas and sociodramas help unconscious fears step out and find a cure, it is relevant to imagine borrowing those techniques to psychology and adapting them to a business class session attended by gifted individual(s). Here, psychodrama distinguishes from role-playing since the actors choose the frame into which they shall play; they have a full control on allocating the roles while in the second case roles are decided upstream.

This light difference is nevertheless essential: let's here be reminded that the purpose of the psychodrama is to make the subject reach catharsis by turning subconscious conflicts into conscious realities. If the instructor forces the scenario, s/he projects his/her own fantasies, not the student's ones. Suggesting the game without any further constraint is certainly the best way to leave enough space to all students for them to release their subconscious weights, which is mainly wholesome for the gifted ones.

As far as the application is concerned, many psychodrama aspects do actually fit in tutorial formats: for example, in both cases (1) a crisis situation can be imagined; (2) one subject is surrounded by others to 'play'; (3) the subject chooses the situation, thus reducing his/her anxiety by being in control of the story, and (4) a leader manages the whole. The main differences between a psychodrama session and a psychodrama-based tutorial logically lie in the facts that students are not patients, and that the coordinator is a teacher, not a psychologist. But just like in the psychodrama's approach, students are in total control of the scenario. Indeed, the bridges between both a psychodrama and an academic tutorial are numerous enough to justify the exploration of such technique to try and better help gifted students integrate their various working groups.

As a summary, this is what we know at this stage:

- French business schools prefer lecturing than experiential teaching;
- gifted people are in high psychological suffering;
- gifted students do not find support in the French academic tradition;
- psychodramas help express internal conflicts thanks to the role played by others;
- most of unsolved conflicts are unconscious;

- psychodrama-based tutorials might help gifted students as well as provide new learning perspectives to business schools;
- since psychodramas help subjects find the way to the conflict inside by being in control of a scenario, substituting oneself to the tutorial's instructor might relieve a gifted subject and release unsuspected teaching solutions.

So, we here describe a psychodrama-based tutorial tentative, which eventually helped a gifted student both realise her capabilities and reduce her natural paranoid level of stress that most talented people feel. In order to stick as closely as possible to a psychodrama session, the experiment took place within the following framework:

- a Consumer Behaviour class tutorial;
- a different place than the usual classroom to create role-playing decorum, indeed painting display area;
- a group of students limited to 10 subjects to reinforce intimacy;
- an introductory speech to inform students about the tutorial and about the academic objectives of the exercises without ever referring to the presence of a gifted student;
- 1 to 2-student teams to make sure everyone would play both influencers and influenced roles thanks to the number of possible occurrences;
- and no further direction in order to let them move and create according to a psychodrama-based framework and not according to a role-playing one.

Once installed in the room, students were asked to imagine a creative scenario that would make them control someone's behaviour. The latter would be written before performing to be able to check any deviation between the expected outcome and the final result. No further instruction or guidance was provided in order to leave full space to the psychodrama's benefit.

Let's here also be reminded that the students did not suspect the presence of a gifted person among them, the latter being more considered a shy and withdrawn person. Moreover, each student had the choice to lead the session and to be in control when presenting his/her team's case. Among the various scenarios, we here focus on one group who had decided to make the gifted student wear a helmet, which was not hers despite the fact she had one (Case 1), and on the gifted student who aimed at making a girl blush in front of the class (Case 2). because they both concern the gifted subject. Those hypotheses seemed very demanding since (1) gifted people are naturally defensive, and (2) making someone blush is nearly impossible when the subject knows s/he is the target.

Results

Both psychodramas proved to be successful:

- Case 1: Students imagined shooting a timeless movie to justify the fact that most would be solicited to play various absurd roles. Expecting resistance from the gifted subject, the leaders easily borrowed her own helmet after she had refused to participate, thus protecting herself from possibly being the target. Seeing most of the students on stage created a feeling of frustration in her, which drove her to willingly step in. To do so, she had to wear another helmet to play the role that had been allocated to her, making the experiment a success.
- Case 2: The gifted student willingly failed in making her target blush, driving the teacher to explain to her why she had failed the exercise before she would eventually show a second paper on which she had written that her real target was the teacher, and that her objective was to make the latter explain to her why she had failed.

The teacher and two assistants who attended the session collected the parametered data through observation. They would compare the objectives and the resources deployed, and notice possible deviations between the aim and the outcomes. The gifted student was later interviewed individually in order to collect the primary data, *i.e.* determine the benefit of this exercise for her. This moment, which psychologists call the “processing”, is essential to get a feedback about the possible outcome of the exercise. The student was then asked how did she imagine her scenario, how did she project herself into the role of a potential victim - case #1 - and manipulator - case #2, what made her consider things worked, and what could be improved. She was then asked from a more personal perspective if this approach had contributed to make her feel better within her formal group despite her mental difference. To those various questions, she replied in a positive and constructive way, mainly stressing the fact that she liked the intellectual challenge since manipulating others would obviously start by observing, listening, and somehow caring to be able to understand someone’s subconscious reflexes. She felt that being the victim in the first case had been constructive since others had obviously borrowed the same path of observing, listening, and caring, providing her with kind of an existence within the group. She also liked being in control of a scenario, relieved from any constraint of time and framework. She quickly forgot she was participating to an academic exercise; so, she quickly got involved in the process, freeing herself from all her recurrent internal conflicts.

Discussion

This psychodrama-based experience was beyond a mere consumer behaviour exercise for the gifted student since she identified most of her conflicts as the game was moving on.

For example, she realised that her giftedness was eventually not a curse but merely a chance, a source of synergic solutions. She was happy to have been chosen in case #1 and successfully guided to behave in a way she did not expect, just like she was happy to have reached her own objective in case #2. On the one hand, she realised that she was much more 'normal' than expected, and on the other hand, she enjoyed using her capabilities.

As a summary, this student no longer saw herself from a vertical perspective - alone in the heights, but from a horizontal one: different but complementary to others. The impact on her was immediately positive since she would now talk about her strengths and weaknesses to other students when sharing their impressions about this experience, with no fear of rejection or mockery. As expected, those two scenario examples are encouraging in transposing some psychodrama characteristics into academic tutorials. In the present case, the gifted student drew important conclusions that would positively impact her future behaviours: (1) she learned how to turn an anxiety-based situation into a game, (2) she realised that anyone can be someone's target, thus decreasing her paranoid tendencies, (3) she found space to express her own mental and psychological capabilities, (4) she learned that working in a group can be as constructive as working alone, and (5) she was proposed new teaching and learning possibilities, which is essential when dealing with talented minds.

Yet, the educational output proposed here nevertheless conflicts with several limits:

- Not all courses allow such games to take place; notwithstanding the perspectives provided by a psychodrama approach, Consumer Behaviour and HR classes are certainly more valuable fields of experiment than Corporate Finance or Economics could ever be. Yet, business programmes are rich enough to be able to find enough perspectives and space to implement psychology-based games in order to help gifted students.

- The absence of a medical professional during the tutorial certainly limits the possibilities and the impact of the exercise. On the other hand, such presence could hardly be justified in a business tutorial. Moreover, seeking solutions to help gifted students through psychodrama protocols does not aim at replacing any psychological treatment. It is only an ersatz, which can eventually prove to become a valuable academic asset.
- The psychodrama-based tutorial alternative is only a tool, thus holding no guarantee of success in terms of gifted student's identification and help. Further research would be well advised to investigate additional cross disciplines' contribution to enrich the tool.
- Low group cohesion and numerous participants might make the process inefficient.
- One of the psychodrama's key requirements is to build a group made of an equivalent number of males and females, which might be difficult to replicate with a formal group.
- Another psychodrama's key requirement is to stop participants from any physical contact, which, again, might be complex to implement within the French freedom culture.
- Ideally, the scene should take place in decorum in order to help gifted students disconnect from their daily routine, for example a mock courtroom. But all business schools do not have the opportunity to afford such equipment.
- A psychodrama can usually last up to 3 hours, which is not adapted to the usual tutorial's 90 minute-sessions. Customised formats should be imagined to cope with this constraint.
- Last but not least, replicating a psychodrama-based tutorial is the highest challenge. Indeed, a protocol should ideally exist for instructors to use this technique whatever the audience and whatever the topic. Constraints are as follows: (0) gifted students are identified; (1) those at-risk students need to bloom in their academic environment; (2) the business school gives priority to experiential teaching and learning through workshops to improve staff awareness; (3) investments are available to equip rooms for psychodrama-based tutorials purposes; (4) students, including the gifted one(s), find the way to their conflicts by being in control of

the scenario, thus substituting themselves to the instructor; (5) students are alternatively in execution and in control of the scenario; (6) the challenge is creative enough to make students use their subconscious, and (7) the real objective of the tutorial is explained and discussed individually after class with the gifted student(s).

Conclusions

This paper introduces the need for a mutation in the French higher education tradition from lecturing to experiential teaching.

It presents the case of gifted students who, despite their limited number, deserve as much care as their peers, and suggests the possibility to develop psychodrama-based tutorials. It aims at initiating such an academic mutation while supporting gifted students' integration and anchoring self-esteem. Gifted people often have to deal with blank mental moments, feelings of memory, fantasy, creativity, or dreamlike voids. In this regard, they feel disconnected from their own body and life, which leads to blocking their social relations. Past conflicts then seem obviously recurrent; such states create a pain, and the only solution is often to block all mnemonic processes and develop somatisation, emptiness, as well as identity loss.

Trying to deal with those issues during face-to-face sessions leads nowhere since gifted people either fear having nothing to say due to the barriers they have raised, or by fear of creating an addiction to the psychoanalytic process. The psychodrama is an answer to those fears since the subject not only is in control of his/her curing framework, but also mixed with a group into which communication is easy. For those reasons, psychodrama-based tutorials appear to be relevant answers to gifted students' integration issues. Yet, as of today, many variables remain out of knowledge. For example, despite the massive progress of research in neuroscience and psychology, we are still far from understanding our brain's meanders.

We do not know why some people develop abnormal talents, we do not know how many students are really concerned by giftedness, and notwithstanding evolutionary recruitment processes, we do not know if we really are in the presence of a talented student when suspecting giftedness, unless confirmed by a psychologist. But we know that such students do exist, that they deserve care, and that the US tradition of experiential teaching and learning has long ago proved to be an essential asset in a maieutic spirit. Although limited, those reasons are sufficient for France to keep investigating the field of experiential teaching for the sake of both knowledge and at-risk students. Research here remains embryonic and risky. For example, we also do not know what would be the impact of a failed psychodrama-based approach on a highly disturbed mind, whatever its level of giftedness. But this should not be a barrier if we someday want to reach a protocol that could be replicated and used wisely. This shall mark the start of further research in the field.

Investigating new teaching and learning techniques is certainly as noble as fascinating, especially when the objective is to contribute in integrating students who are naturally rejected, and who suffer from multiple personal unconscious fears and other panicking syndromes. Seeking solutions among psychology-based tools proves to be relevant thanks to the numerous bridges linking various Management and Social Sciences courses. Acceleration and in-depth techniques remain efficient. Yet, such efficiency shall be developed with the collateral contribution of techniques and tools both aimed at detecting talented potentials, and contributing in making gifted people merely accept themselves the way they are.

References

- Allport, D.A. (1980). Attention and Performance. In G. Claxton (Ed.). *Cognitive Psychology: New Directions* (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul).
- Anderson, L. & Krathwohl, D. (2001). *A Taxonomy for Learning, Teaching, and Assessing: A Revision of Bloom's Taxonomy of Educational Objectives*. New York: Longman.
- Anzieu, D. (2004). *Le psychodrame analytique: Chez l'enfant et l'adolescent*. Puf.
- Appleyard, K., Egeland, B., van Dulmen, M. & Sroufe, L.A. (2005). When More is not Better: The Role of Cumulative Risk in Child Behavior Outcomes. *Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry*, 46, 235-245.
- Bandura, A. (1982). Self-Efficacy Mechanism in Human Agency. *American Psychologist*, 37, 122-147.
- Becerril-Maillefert, C. (2013). *Le psychodrame*. Eyrolles.
- Bedart, K. and Dhuey, E. (2006). The Persistence of Early Childhood Maturity: International Evidence of Long-Run Age Effects. *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 121, 1437-1472.
- Binet, A. (1905). New Methods for the Diagnosis of the Intellectual Level of Subnormals. *L'Année Psychologique*, 12, 191-244.

Blackwell, L.S., Trzesniewski, K.& Dweck, C.S. (2007). Implicit Theories of Intelligence Predict Achievement Across an Adolescent Transition: A Longitudinal Study and an Intervention.*Child Development*, 78, 246-263.

Boggs, J.G., Mickel, A.E.& Holtom, B.C. (2007). Experiential Learning Through Interactive Drama: An Alternative to Student Role Plays,*Journal of Management Education*, 31(6), 832-858.

Borredon, L., Deffayet, S. Baker, A. & Kolb, D. (2011). Enhancing Deep Learning: Lessons from the Introduction of Learning Teams in Management Education in France.*Journal of Management Education*, 35(3). 324-350.

Botez-Marquard, T. & Boller, F. (2005).*Neuropsychologie clinique et neurologie du comportement*. Montréal: Les Presses de l'Université de Montréal.

Boujon, C. (2002).*L'inhibition au carrefour des neurosciences et des sciences de la cognition*. Marseille: Solal, coll. Neurosciences.

Bradford, D. L. & LeDuc, R. (1975). One Approach to the Care and Teaching of Introductory O.B..*Journal of Management Education*, 1,18.

Calevoi, N., Darge, G., Gossart, R., Hayat, M., Kockelmeyer, S., Scandariato, R.& Sferrazza, R. (2010).*Le psychodrame psychanalytique metathérapeutique*. De Boeck.

Campbell, F.A., Pungello, E.P., Miller-Johnson, S., Burchinal, M. & Ramey, C.T. (2001). The Development of Cognitive and Academic Abilities: Growth Curves from an Early Childhood Educational Experiment. *Developmental Psychology*, 37, 231-242.

Carr, T.H. (2004). A Multileveled Approach of Selective Attention: Monitoring Environmental Space, Choosing Stimuli for Deep Processing and Retrieving Information from Memory. In M.I. Posner (Ed.), *Cognitive Neuroscience of Attention* (New York: Guilford Press).

Ceci, S.J. & Williams, W.M. (2011). Understanding Current Causes of Women's Underrepresentation in Science. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Science, USA*, 106, 3157-3162.

Clinkenbeard, P.R. (2012). Neuroscience and Young Children: Implications for the Diversity of Gifted programming. In R. Subotnik, R. Robinson, C. Callahan, P. Johnson & E.J. Gubbins (Eds.), *Malleable Minds: Translating Insights from Psychology and Neurosciences to Gifted Education*. Storrs: National Research Center on the Gifted and Talented, University of Connecticut.

Colom, R., Karama, S., Jung, R.E. & Haier, R.J. (2010). Human Intelligence and Brain Networks. *Dialogues in Clinical Neurosciences*, 12, 489-501.

Corbetta, M. & Shulman, G.L. (2002). Control of Goal-Directed and Stimulus-Driven Attention in the Brain. *Nature Reviews Neuroscience*, 3, 201-215.

Coyle, T.R.& Pillow, D.R. (2008). SAT and ACT Predict GPA After Removing *g.Intelligence*, 36, 719-729.

Cyrulnik, B. & Duval, P. (2006). *Psychanalyse et résilience*. Paris: Odile Jacob.

Delaroche, P. (2011). *Jouer pour de vrai*. Eres.

Diezmann, C.M.& Watters, J.J. (2006). Balancing Opportunities for Learning and Practicing for Gifted Students. *Curriculum Matters*, 5(1), 3-5.

Duckworth, A.L.& Seligman, M.E.P. (2005). Self-Discipline Outdoes IQ in Predicting Academic Performance of Adolescents. *Psychological Science*, 16, 939-944.

Dumas, J.E. (2002). *Psychopathologie de l'enfant et de l'adolescent*. Bruxelles: De Boeck - Larcier.

Dumet, N. & Ménéchal, J. (2005). *Quinze cas cliniques en psychopathologie de l'adulte*. Paris: Dunod.

Fancher, R. (1996). *Pioneers of Psychology*. 3rd ed, Norton, New York.

Fine, M.J. (1991). *Collaboration with Parents of Exceptional Children*. Brandon: Center for Parent/Professional Collaboration.

Fischbein, S. (1980). IQ and Social Class. *Intelligence*, 4, 51-63.

Flynn, J.R. (1987). Massive IQ Gains in 14 Nations: What IQ Tests Really Measure.*Psychological Bulletin*, 101, 171-191.

Frasier, M.M. & Passow, A.H. (1994).*Towards a New Paradigm for Identifying Talent Potentials*. Storrs: National Research Center on the Gifted and Talented, University of Connecticut.

Friedman, T.L. (2007).*The World is Flat: A Brief History of the 21st Century*. 3rd Edition, New York, NY: Farrar, Strausand Giroux.

Gallos, J. (2008). Charting a New Course for the Scholarship of Management Teaching and Learning: Future Directions, Powerful Opportunities, a Hopeful Future.*Journal of Management Education*, 32(5), 535-540.

Gallos, J. (2009). Artful Teaching: Using the Visual, Creative and Performing Arts in Contemporary Management Education. In S. Armstrong and C. Fukami, (Eds, SAGE Publications Ltd),*The SAGE Handbook of Management Learning, Education and Development*, 187-212.

Gardner, H. (1999).*Intelligence Reframed: Multiple Intelligences for the 21-Century*. Basic Books-Wiley, New York.

Gentaz, E. & Hatwell, Y. (2004). Geometrical Haptic Illusion: Role of Exploratory Movements in the Muller-Lyer, Vertical-Horizontal and Delboeuf Illusions. *Psychonomic Bulletin and Review*, 11, 31-40.

Goldsztaub, L. (2009). *Sociodrame et psychodrame analytiques* Eres.

Goleman, D. (2005). *Emotional Intelligence*. Bantam Books, New York.

Guillaume, P. (1979). *La Psychologie de la forme*. Flammarion, Paris.

Herrnstein, R.J., Nickerson, R.S., Sanchez, M.& Sweets, J.A. (1986). Teaching Thinking Skills. *American Psychologist*, 41, 1279-1289.

Horn, J. L. & Cattell, R. B. (1967). Age Differences in Fluid and Crystallized Intelligence. *Acta Psychologica*, 26, 107-129.

Jewell, P. (2005). Humor in Cognitive and Social Development: Creative Artists and Class Clowns. *International Education Journal*, 6(2), 200-205.

Judge, T.A., Klinger, R.L.& Simon, L.S. (2010). Time is on my Side: Time, General Mental Ability, Human Capital, and Extrinsic Career Success. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 95, 92-107.

Kail, M. & Fayol, M. (2003). *Les sciences cognitives et l'école*. Paris: PUF.

Kamin, L.J. (1995). The Pioneers of IQ Testing. In Russell Jacoby & Naomi Glauber (Eds.), *The Bell Curve Debate: History, Documents, Opinions*. Times Books, New York.

Karlgaard, R. (2010). Scary Smart. *Forbes*, 186, 26.

Kesner, J.E. (2005). Gifted Children's Relationships with Teachers.*International Education Journal*, 6(2),218-223.

Kell, H.J., Lubinski, D. & Benbow, C.P. (2013). Who Rises to the Top? Early Indicators.*Psychological Science*, 24(5), 648-659.

Kell, H.J., Lubinski, D., Benbow, C.P.& Steiger, J.H. (2013). Creativity and Technical Innovation: Spatial Ability's Unique Role.*Psychological Science*, 24, 1831-1836.

Kolb, A.Y.& Kolb, D.A. (2009). Experiential Learning Theory: A Dynamic, Holistic Approach to Management Learning, Education, and Development. In S. Armstrong and C. Fukami, (Eds, SAGE Publications Ltd.),*The SAGE Handbook of Management Learning, Education and Development*, 42-68.

Krause, K., Bochner, S., Duchesne, S. (2003).*Educational Psychology for Learning and Teaching*. Southbank, Victoria: Thomson.

Lechevalier, B., Eustache, F.& Viader, F. (1995).*Perceptions et agnosies*. Bruxelles: De Boeck Université.

Le Ny, J.F. (2005).*Comment l'esprit produit du sens*. Paris: Odile Jacob.

Lezak, M.D., Howienson, D.B.& Loring, D.W. (2004).*Neuropsychological Assessment*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Leveton, E. (2001). *A Clinician's Guide to Psychodrama*. 3rd edition, Springer Publishing Company.

Lorin, C. (2010). *Guérir par le théâtre thérapeutique*. L'Harmattan.

Lubinski, D. (2009). Cognitive Epidemiology: With Emphasis on Untangling Cognitive Ability and Socioeconomic Status. *Intelligence*, 37, 625-633.

Lubinski, D. & Benbow, C.P. (2006). Study of Mathematically Precocious Youth after 35 Years: Uncovering Antecedents for the Development of Math-Science Expertise. *Perspectives on Psychological Science*, 1, 316-345.

Mayer, R.E. (Ed.). (2005). *The Cambridge Handbook of Multimedia Learning*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

McCoach, D.B. & Siegle, D. (2003). Factors that Differentiate Underachieving Gifted Students from High-Achieving Gifted Students. *Gifted Child Quarterly*, 47, 144-154.

McGlone, M.S. & Aronson, J. (2006). Stereotype Threat, Identity Salience, and Spatial Reasoning. *Journal of Applied Developmental Psychology*, 27, 486-493.

McClelland, D.C., Baldwin, A.L, Bronfenbrenner, U. & Strodbeck, F.L. (1958). *Talent and Society*. Princeton, NJ: VanNostrand.

Mockler, R.J. (2002). Using the Arts to Acquire and Enhance Management Skills.*Journal of Management Education*, 26(5), 574-585.

Neisser, U., Boodoo, G., Bouchard, T.J. Jr, Boykin, A.W., Brody, N, Ceci, S.F. & Urbina, S. (1996). Intelligence: Knowns and Unknowns.*American Psychologist*, 51, 77-101.

Nisbett, R.E., Aronson, J., Blair, C., Dickens, W., Flynn, J.R., Halpern, D.F. & Turkheimer, E. (2012). Intelligence. New Findings and Theoretical Developments.*American Psychologist*, 67(2), 130-159.

Oberauer, K. (2003). Selective Attention to Elements in Working Memory.*Experimental Psychology*, 50, 257-269.

Park, G., Lubinski, D. & Benbow, C.P. (2013). When Less is More: Effects of Grade Skipping on Adult STEM Productivity among Mathematically Precocious Adolescents.*Journal of Educational Psychology*, 105, 176-198.

Picard, D., Dacremont, C., Valentin, D. & Giboreau, A. (2003). Perceptual Dimensions of Tactile Textures.*Acta Psychologica*, 114, 165-184.

Pollack, R.H. & Brenner, M.W. (1969).*The Experimental Psychology of Alfred Binet: Selected Papers*. Springer Publishing Company, Inc, New York.

Ramsden, S., Richardson, F.M., Josse, G., Thomas, M.S.C., Ellis, C., Shakeshaft, C. & Price, C.J. (2011). Verbal and Non-Verbal Intelligence Changes in the Teenage Brain. *Nature*, 479, 113-116.

Renzulli, J.S. (2006). Swimming Up-Stream in a Small River: Changing Conceptions and Practices about the Development of Giftedness. In M.A. Constanas & R.J. Sternberg (Eds.), *Translating Theory and Research into Educational Practice: Developments in Content Domains, Large-Scale Reform, and Intellectual Capacity*. Mahway, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.

Rimé, B. (2005). *Le partage social des émotions*. Paris: PUF, collection Psychologie Sociale.

Rogers, K.B. (2007). Lessons Learned about Educating the Gifted and Talented: A Synthesis of the Research on Educational Practice. *The Gifted Child Quarterly*, 51(4), 382 – 396.

Salem, I. (2013). *Vues nouvelles sur le psychodrama psychanalytique*. EDK: Pluriels de la psyché.

Schmidt-Wilk, J. (2010). Evidence: Where Scholarship Meets Artistry. *Journal of Management Education*, 34(2), 195-199.

Schunk, D.H., Pintrich, P.R. & Meece, M.L. (2008). *Motivation in Education: Theory, Research, and Applications*. 3rd Edition, Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson.

Shore, S. (2003). My Life with Asperger Syndrome. In DuCharme, R.W. & Gullotta, T.P. (Eds), *Asperger Syndrome. A Guide for Professionals and Families*. New York: Kluwer Academic.

Siegler, R.S. (1992). The Other Alfred Binet. *Developmental Psychology*, 28, 179-190.

Spearman, C. (1904). "General Intelligence", Objectively Determined and Measured. *American Journal of Psychology*, 15, 201-293.

Sternberg, R.J. & Davidson, J.E. (2005). *Conceptions of Giftedness, 2nd Edition*. Boston, MA: Cambridge University Press.

Su, R., Rounds, J. & Armstrong, P.I. (2009). Men and Things, Women and People: A Meta-Analysis of Sex Differences in Interests. *Psychological Bulletin*, 35, 859-884.

Terman, L. M. & Merrill, M. A. (1960). *Stanford-Binet Intelligence Scale*. Houghton Mifflin Company, Boston.

Tomlinson, C.A., Ford, D.H., Reis, S.M., Briggs, C.J. & Strickland, C.A. (2004). *In Search of the Dream: Designing Schools and Classrooms that Work for High Potential Students from Diverse Cultural Backgrounds*. Washington, DC: The National Association for Gifted Children and National Research Center on the Gifted and Talented.

Wai, J., Lubinski, D. & Benbow, C.P. (2009). Spatial Ability for STEM Domains: Aligning over Fifty Years of Cumulative Psychological Knowledge Solidifies its Importance.*Journal of Educational Psychology, 101*, 817-835.

Walton, G.M. & Spencer, S.J. (2009). Latent Ability: Grades and Test Scores Systematically Underestimate the Intellectual Ability of Negatively Stereotyped Students.*Psychological Science, 20*, 1132-1139.

Wicherts, J.M., Jelte, M., Dolan, C.V. & Hessen, D.J. (2004). Are Intelligence Test Measurements Invariant Over Time? Investigating the nature of the Flynn Effect.*Intelligence, 32*, 509-537.

Zakaria, F. (2011).*The Post-American World*. New York, NY: W.W. Norton.