



# SENG Journal: Exploring the Psychology of Giftedness

---

Volume 1 | Issue 2

---

September 2022

## Challenging the Status Quo Through Theory, Research, Practice, and Leadership: An Interview with Paula Olszewski-Kubilius

Paula Olszewski-Kubilius

Northwestern University, [p-olszewski-kubilius@northwestern.edu](mailto:p-olszewski-kubilius@northwestern.edu)

Tracy L. Cross

William & Mary, [tlcross@wm.edu](mailto:tlcross@wm.edu)

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholarworks.wm.edu/sengj>



Part of the [Gifted Education Commons](#)

---


### Recommended Citation


Olszewski-Kubilius, P., & Cross, T. L. (2022). Challenging the Status Quo Through Theory, Research, Practice, and Leadership: An Interview with Paula Olszewski-Kubilius. *SENG Journal: Exploring the Psychology of Giftedness*, 1(2), 16-22. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.25774/7PDN-4540>

This Interview is brought to you for free and open access by the Journals at W&M ScholarWorks. It has been accepted for inclusion in SENG Journal: Exploring the Psychology of Giftedness by an authorized editor of W&M ScholarWorks. For more information, please contact [scholarworks@wm.edu](mailto:scholarworks@wm.edu).



## Challenging the Status Quo Through Theory, Research, Practice, and Leadership: An Interview with Paula Olszewski-Kubilius

Paula Olszewski-Kubilius, Ph.D. 

Interviewed by Tracy L. Cross, Ph.D. 

Over the past four decades, Paula Olszewski-Kubilius has directed the Northwestern University Center for Talent Development. She has been a leader in research on out-of-school programs, especially those that help typically underrepresented students. Her ideas about talent development, which she wrote about with colleagues Rena Subotnik and Frank Worrell, have had a profound effect on the field of gifted education. In the summer of 2022, she and Tracy L. Cross had a conversation about her experiences and perspectives as a leader in the field.



Dr. Paula Olszewski-Kubilius

**Cross** • *Please give a little background about yourself, like when did you come to be a part of this program? How did that happen? And just a little bit of description of your earliest days, if you would.*

**Olszewski-Kubilius** • When I went to Northwestern for my Ph.D., there was no program in gifted. It was not on my mind. I never thought about it.

My Ph.D. was in educational psychology, and it was really in the development of young children. I was really interested in their cognitive development, and did my dissertation on fantasy play.

And that was a very personal interest because as a child, I did a lot of fantasy play and it was very soothing and very imaginative. And it was a big part of my childhood that I remember. I was applying for jobs, post-docs and wasn't getting anywhere. It wasn't a good job outlook at the time.

Joyce VanTassel-Baska had come to Northwestern to start the Center for Talent Development. And at that time, it was called the Midwest Talent Search. And so I needed a job and she had gotten a grant from the Fry Foundation to educate teachers in the Midwest on how to identify giftedness among low income and minority students.

So she hired me to work on this grant, and that's how I got introduced to the field. And it just intrigued me immediately, personally because I had always been that nerdy, intellectual girl who found a lot of me in the literature, but also just because of the work with lower income kids, which was really intriguing to me. I have been working at Northwestern in the program for 40 years now.

I'm really self-taught. I was very fortunate to work with Joyce because Joyce was at the peak of her career at

that point. She was very well-connected to other people in the field, and she introduced me to people like John Feldhusen and Don Treffinger and Carolyn Callahan and Jim Gallagher.

As a neophyte to the field, I was able to sit with those people. Even Bob Sternberg, she knew and I got to meet. And I had not had that kind of mentoring during my doctoral program. So that was really helpful and cemented my interest in the field.

**Cross** • *That's really neat. Joyce has had such an incredible impact on the field. It's hard to even imagine trying to get a handle on it. But her connecting people, that was something I've always admired about her, that she does that in a generous way. What were your earliest roles there at CTD?*

**Olszewski-Kubilius** • So when she started the center, I worked on this grant and then the first year I was there, she ran a summer program and she ran a talent search. I didn't have much to do with the talent search at first. But with the programming, it was a residential program and it was for seventh and eighth graders. It was the first program we ran.

And I was actually helping with the residential part of the program and even staying in the dorms overnight. And that was a very interesting experience, and one I never repeated. But at any rate, I started working with her on the academic programming.

She had already started LetterLinks, which was by mail or correspondence program, which evolved into an online learning program that exists today. And we started the Saturday program, then the weekend program in the fall and all of those programs still exist today.

My first role, and for a long time, was the academic programming. And since Joyce was also interested in research, we did research as well, mostly on the programming and the kids who were in the programs.

**Cross** • *So you started with the grant. What came next for you?*

**Olszewski-Kubilius** • I think I was there five years and had just been, at that point, really delving into the field because I had to really catch up with the scholarship

in the field and started doing some research and was learning more about the existing literature. I was still really involved in the logistics of all the programming, hiring the teachers and getting the rooms and all that kind of stuff, which I knew then I wanted to not do on a continual basis. It's very difficult.

But at any rate, so Joyce got recruited to William & Mary. And I was just getting married in the summer of '87 and she was leaving then. And so I was tapped by the dean to take over on an interim basis as director. And so I did. And after about six months, he said to me, "You're doing well." That was Dean Wiley. "You're doing well at this and I can see you're really interested in it, so we're going to make you the director."

And I was pretty much director since then with a short hiatus when I had my two children, when I stepped away from the directorship to just do research, and then stepped back in when they were a little older.

**Cross** • *That's always been an amazing part of your story. I've appreciated that you did that, were able to do that. It is such an important thing to be able to do. And were there a couple of folks in that period or those periods who stepped in, or what happened as leadership goes?*

**Olszewski-Kubilius** • Yeah. The center was growing and Benjamin Bloom had come. He had retired from University of Chicago and the dean recruited him to be at Northwestern. And he was only there for a couple of years, but he was influential in the naming of the center. That's why I think along with our dean, David Wiley, it was named Center for Talent Development, which as was odd at the time, an odd name for a center like ours. Over the years, there were various people we hired then to take over the talent search and to do the programming. And I moved to a higher level. So at first, I was an assistant director and then I was an associate director. So I worked right under Joyce.

At that time, there was more connectedness within the Midwest for leaders in gifted education. And so the talent search, which was a replication of what Julian Stanley started at Johns Hopkins, at the Center for Talented Youth, it was really growing. And I think at its peak, we had 30,000 students in the talent search. It's not the case today for a variety of reasons.

Programs continue to grow in terms of number of student participants. But the basic set of summer, weekend and online continued to be the basic set of programs. We extended the programming to younger students and to older students so that eventually, at least with me being as director, we were serving children, preschool through grade 12.

Now we put more of a focus on continuing pathways through various subject areas over time. So we began tweaking what we were doing in response to changes in the scholarship, to what we were learning. A good example, just one example, so we no longer have selective

programs for our younger kids. Any child can enroll in our programs that are preschool through grade two.

The reason being is that we've realized that there's wide variation in children's opportunities in those younger grades. And a lot of kids, particularly minoritized groups of students, don't have as many opportunities to learn in their early environments. And so we want to give them that opportunity rather than restrict it to kids who have those, are lucky enough to have those kinds of environments early in their lives.

So over the years, we've, of course, moved to more online programming. But we've really tried to respond to what we learned about talent development over the years, so what the basics have been there, but they've been changed.

**Cross** • *It's been, for me, very exciting to see what I guess I would call an evolution, I don't know, maybe it was faster pace, but the great expanse of what all was going on there. Going back in my career at Ball State University about 30 years ago, I was watching with appreciation as you continued to do the things you're talking about.*

*It didn't seem like you were, in any way, resting on your laurels, that you were attacking some of the cultural limitations in our field. And like what you were describing for the younger children, having access to your programs regardless of, or given some of the impediments we know to be important in their lives.*

*So I always admired that about your program or your leadership really more than anything, was I think it took a kind of wisdom and courage to do that. Because it seemed to me that you could have continued to serve the same group for a long period of time. But by expanding it, it just seemed to meet the needs of many more of the children and their families.*

**Olszewski-Kubilius** • So Joyce seriously started this focus on underrepresented kids.

She herself came from a lower income family, and she would say that it was a lower income family situation. And she was really devoted to the idea that kids needed these opportunities. So that was always a theme for CTD. We were always seeking grants and money to support students with scholarship money, to support students whose families didn't have the resources to send them, because all our programming was tuition-based.

And so that's always been very prominent in our history. Interestingly enough, I think there's always been criticism, as you know, of gifted programming as just serving advantaged kids. But in my experience, centers like ours and yours have always tried to expand services to kids who've been underrepresented.

And I think over the years, we've learned a lot more about how best to do that and how to serve kids, because there are kids who come to school, as you know, who are really ready to soar. And those kids should be accommodated with faster-paced programming and higher-level content. And there are other kids who have potential that's not obvious in achievement, and how

do we identify those kids? And then what do we do for them? And that's really been a focus of my work and I know of some of your work too. And I think that's for the betterment of the field.

**Cross** • *Yes. And I do appreciate your giving credit to Joyce because I think she's always been a leader in that way. Not always recognized as such, but I certainly have benefited from it at William & Mary.*

*I wanted to ask you about one of the things I've always admired about you, that is your commitment to field-based research. And in my personal experience and assessment, and even when I teach courses on research methodology, it's clearly more complicated to do your research in that manner. It requires the type of wisdom and decision-making that takes place in real-time among other things. Can you talk to me just a little bit about your field-based research?*

**Olszewski-Kubilius** • So it was a deliberate action on my part or strategy. Let's put it that way. So when I took the position at the Center for Talent Development, I realized that a lot of my energy was going to go into doing programs and services for kids and families and educators, because that was what brought in the funds to do other things.

And that was really what a large part of our mission was. But being a scholar, having that, wanting to be that, I decided if I was going to put the energy and work into these programs, I was going to research them so that other people could benefit from what we learned.

And Joyce emphasized this, "If you're going to do this work, combine it with research." So in the initial years I was at the center, a lot of it was looking at the effects of the programs we were running on students, perceptions of themselves, or how their parents viewed them—those kinds of issues..

And then we got into other kinds of work like Project Excite where we were working with young students, primarily African American and Hispanic students who, in the local school system, were underrepresented in high school honors classes, intervening at third grade and really making sure those kids were prepared and had opportunities that would enable them to enter high school performing at a level that was consistent more with their potential.

Then as you know, because you've been involved with this with Project OCCAMS (Online Curriculum Consortium for Accelerating Middle School) where we work with the middle school kids in Ohio to make sure that kids who would not qualify by state criteria as gifted, but were high potential, had the opportunity to do an accelerated language arts class and enter high school already ahead in language arts.

And so that work has been really rewarding because we've seen that some of these interventions can work, and we've passed it on to other educators. In the case of the program in Ohio, what's been really rewarding is that even though we don't have any more funding, as you

know, we were funded by Jack Kent Cook Foundation and initially by a Javits Grant, that program has become institutionalized within Columbus public schools, which is rare.

It's rare that a program that's funded by grants gets institutionalized. In other words, people buy in to the extent that they continue it, they find a way to continue it, even though the grant money isn't there. So often as you know, when grant money goes away, programs go away.

And it's very difficult to institutionalize a program. So the other thing I've learned and become interested in is that there's this whole debate, as you know, in education about randomized controlled trials, and as a way to really understand whether something is having an effect on students. It's the only way to control these extraneous variables.

But there's limitations to that because that is not necessarily ecologically valid. Unless we understand how a program that's designed to help students, a specific group of students that exists within an environment, within a system, then we can understand all the necessary components that need to be in place in order for it to be successful.

So as you know, in Columbus, the first few years we were there, we had a very solid, just the best coordinator of programming there. And as a result, that had a huge difference in our success. And as you know, in other places in Ohio, when we didn't have that, we were much less successful.

And now, that that person has left Columbus, it's at a time when the program we started is already institutionalized because she helped do that. So it's no longer needing such an exceptional coordinator in order to survive. So that's one of the things we learned.

I really think for the rest of my career, understanding how you can embed something in a system and all the variables that need to be in place in order for it to be successful is really the heart of educational research in the future.

Schools are systems that have different cultures and lots of components and we're not going to help transfer successful interventions into other schools unless they understand what all needs to be in place.

**Cross** • *That's such a good example that if you don't really understand the power and influence of a calling, all sorts of conclusions that could be made would become somewhat erroneous. As you're suggesting, clearly, she had a huge impact on what went on there, what was accepted, and what was believed etc. Obviously, Project Excite has been really well-received and is one of those rare programs that people refer to as important, well-done, lasting over time, all sorts of good things. And I always felt like that was a special program for you. How would you describe this project?*

**Olszewski-Kubilius** • It was. That was so interesting because the teachers in our summer program, we were

recruiting them from Evanston Township High School, which is the local high school around the university.

And they came to us and said, "Even though the City of Evanston and the school population is really majority-minority students, we don't have these students in our most advanced programs," and the Chem Phys Program, which was their most advanced program. It was an interdisciplinary science program for the best students in the high school.

"And we want them there. And we don't see those kids in your program either. So can we work together?" And everything is a matter of timing. So it was propitious because we had people at the K-8 District and people at the 9-12 District, and a dean at the School of Education who said, "Let's put our heads together and try and tackle this."

And we had a university that said, "We'll give you some money to do this, because it's in our best interest to facilitate the progress of these students." And it was all about tying down relationships. And the university, to its credit, supported financially this program for 15 years. And it became for the center, for my staff our baby, as you said.

And it was because all of us got involved in some level to do parent workshops or to work with individual students or to get resources from the university. All of us got involved. And so it was known by all the staff because the kids came to our programs. And so it was just something that... a program that really tugged at all our hearts. And we worked very hard to make us successful.

And we didn't have a comparison group. We didn't go into it necessarily to do a research study. We went in to do an intervention, to help kids. And I remember when we submitted it for publication, the editors of GCMQ said, "While this study doesn't have a comparison group that we would normally want in order to publish it, because the nature of this intervention to promote potential"—which, at that time, was not really going on in the field—"because of the nature of it, it's so important."

"We want to publish it and here's what you need to do to change it to make it better." So it became a very personal kind of thing. We got close to the families and we got to know the kids really well, their kids who... families who write to us and tell us how the kids are and where they've been and so on. So it was a very uplifting experience for me in the center.

**Cross** • So I'm going to ask you a question that will be phrased oddly. One of the questions I like to ask people like you who are so accomplished is: have you ever had an idea that you pursued to some degree and it just didn't work out for whatever reasons?

Could be infinite reasons why it might not have worked out. But we often talk about our victories, and I don't know that I would... I wouldn't call this a failure. I'd just say maybe it was a dead end or when you got there, it was different than you thought or, I don't know, you adapted and turned a different direction or something along those lines.

**Olszewski-Kubilius** • Let me think. I've had programs like Project Excite before that I tried to do that were less successful, because I didn't know what I was dealing with. I just wasn't ready to really do them. I didn't understand the nature of the problem. So I would say, for example, that I tried programs where we started at middle school and didn't understand that it was too late, especially since our intervention was too modest.

So we weren't that successful. Or I wouldn't call this a mistake necessarily, but I definitely rethought it. As I said, we used to require achievement scores for our young kids programs. And I regret doing that even years ago when everybody did it just because it just doesn't make sense anymore.

I think we weren't creating the pathways into programs that we really wanted to. So I've learned things like there are programs that start, for example, for kids to raise their achievement, to get them into more selective institutions of education at ninth grade.

If you're doing that later in kids' academic careers, you have to work with students who are already showing you higher levels of achievement. If you want to really raise the achievement of kids with potential, but not high achievement, you have to start earlier.

Because those gaps start early. And if you're going to really turn them around, you have to start intervening when kids are young. That's one of the main principles I learned is that depending on when you want to start working with students, you have to be conscious of what kind of student you can really help and improve their achievement, and what level they have to be in order for the intervention to be successful.

**Cross** • I think I probably should have framed the question differently. I could have maybe more appropriately said something like, "What has been an example of your personal learning in research as you progressed across your career?" I think what you described is much more an example of that because you and I read a lot of the same stuff.

I hope that all of us have been engaged in continuous development ourselves in trying to understand and accommodate the students we study and serve. And I think the example you gave is a real good one, that some things aren't that knowable until you try or get involved, and then you learn and you make progress.

Project OCCAMS is a good example that while the pieces of it made a lot of sense to me, the degree of how effective it seems to be surprised me. I thought it would be an incremental improvement over time versus what seems to be a pretty substantial growth in a year or so.

If you imagine that some of the people who might read this interview to be aspiring Ph.D.s or other researchers, what are a couple of things that you have learned or that are happening in the field that you think are really important to the field to make sure that we continue developing in a way that's substantial and important?

**Olszewski-Kubilius** • I think a couple of things. One is there's more and more research being done with these large datasets. I'm not an expert on this, but I think that's

helpful to the field. There are limitations to that because the way giftedness is defined is often high achievement, which some people may not fit their definition.

But I think that looking into these large databases that the government collects has been helpful to the field. I think doing these interventions with kids to understand what works and what doesn't work is always going to get a good amount of uptake, because I think the field is increasingly interested in how to cultivate talent, not identify talent so much, but cultivate talent.

So I think that's important. The other thing is I would say that... and this is into your area, Tracy, there's been all this research on how gifted kids are different, but the bottom line is there's a huge variation among gifted kids, and they're not that different from non-gifted kids.

And so understanding more, not so much what our difference is, but what it takes psychologically to be a high achiever, and what cultivates that in childhood or in school would be more advantageous to the field, so understanding the importance of psychosocial skills, so instead of how psychologically different gifted individuals are.

Not that there aren't some differences, because I think there are in terms of things like need for cognition, need for intellectual stimulation, but we've wasted, I think, a lot of time and energy on finding small differences that really don't matter much.

**Cross** • *Yes. Those are all good points. It's one of the things that, over time, I hope that SENGJ becomes a vehicle for spreading the message you just conveyed, that spending so much time, energy, money, and focus on this assumption that they must be dramatically different, or in ways that a lot of people looked at, maybe should give way to, as you said, what are the essential ingredients to help them be successful as students?*

**Olszewski-Kubilius** • One of the things that's been the most rewarding part of my career has been the collaborations I've had with others. So you and I worked on Project OCCAMS. That's been really fun.

It's benefited from the fact that we have curriculum people, you, as the more psychological-oriented person. It's just benefited from different viewpoints, and I think that's why it was successful. So the collaborations have been really the best part of my career. I would say to young people, "Collaborate with others".

So when Rena, Frank and I got together to write that monograph for the Association for Psychological Science (Subotnik et al., 2011), that brought us together to do a lot of writing. And what I learned from that is that it gets better if you do it with other people, if they review your work and they challenge what you're saying or they edit it, and if you can let go, like being offended that somebody is editing your work.

So it's been really, really rewarding, and especially if you can work with people who have different strengths than you do or different areas of interest that you do and

find ways to do work together and write together. That's been wonderful for me, a blessing, really a blessing in my career.

**Cross** • *I think that time we spent working on that Javits, NRC grant, I don't know how many years ago that's been, probably 20 years ago now, was what you described for me because it was such a great vehicle to get to know the group as individuals so much better and I got to spend time with Joyce.*

*That's really been the most time I've ever spent with Joyce. But seeing her more completely as the human being I've gotten to know has just caused me to admire her even more. Some of the ways she kidded Larry [Laurence J. Coleman] and me saying things like "you guys are just a couple of developmentalists" with that wry smile on her face. Because later, she came around and said something along the lines that she really needed to sit down and rethink some of the assumptions she holds about curriculum. She is such a special person.*

**Olszewski-Kubilius** • Tracy, your work with Larry, and your view of giftedness, being gifted at school—I love that model, and you guys, it was because you talked it all out repeatedly and endlessly that you came up with something that you did that was really useful.

**Cross** • *You and I both been so affected by Joyce, you by other people too. And you have such a nice, big circle of colleagues. I tend to work with one or two people at a time. But it's just what makes it wonderful in my opinion.*

*And the thing we're doing with Gifted Child Today about OCCAMS, that's such a nice bringing together of different people who had a big role in the project, including especially Colleen [Boyle, Columbus, OH program coordinator]. So yes, this is one of the reasons I enjoy doing all this. And it is like the old joke that Steve Martin used to say, "I can't believe that I get paid for doing this."*

*Well, getting to get paid, so to speak, to talk with you and learn more from you, and I've always admired, well, that big group, we worked on that grant for a couple of years from start to finish. And in those days, I was so young to the profession, in some ways to have someone of Joyce's reputation and stature kid me in ways that I really appreciated has stuck with me 20 years later.*

*Are there other things that you would like to comment on? For example, there are a lot of things happening in our field right now. This is a very interesting time. Not long ago, Duke University decided not to continue with Duke TIP, which I was not aware was being considered.*

*So when the decision was made, it was rather surprising to me, because the program was so well-received in the South, and it helped a lot of families and thousands of kids over the years. The Talent Search program in Colorado, that has been around a long time, is also making a similar decision to shut down.*

*Also we know that the numbers of students in prominent programs in different places compared to the way they used to be, are down while certain others are up. What's your general take on where we are in 2022 relative to our efforts to provide services to high ability kids?*

**Olszewski-Kubilius** • I think it's iffy. On the one hand, we have the field embracing talent development, which

is about time, because it's actually been around for a long time.

But the field is now coming to a realization that that's the framework that they need to work with. We really need to focus more on developing talent, especially for children who have been left out of these programs.

And I'm so glad to see it because I think, if we really do that well, it will help solidify gifted education within schools and districts. Because if you're contributing to the solution of the achievement gap problems that all schools are facing, then they're not going to want to cut you when budgets get tough.

That's a good thing, and that could lead to more embeddedness of gifted education within schools. On the other hand, you have a lot of what I consider not nuanced information about testing that's out there that people are using to get rid of tests. There's no doubt that testing has been used in inappropriate ways, right?

But they have a place, they have a place within gifted education and they need to be used judiciously. And so I hope the field can address this more and help schools and districts use assessments judiciously and in appropriate ways.

I don't know what's going to happen, whether that's going to be continuing and we're going to see more and more colleges and universities say, "We don't care about SAT or a ACT scores," or if there's going to be a reckoning where we figure out how they can be used or what tests can be used.

On the other hand, I think the pandemic has taken a toll on gifted centers. A lot of these gifted centers that are providing outside-of-school programming were dependent on serving kids. They're often tuition-based, and they were hit hard by the pandemic because they couldn't do that.

And there are other problems from the pandemic, which include teacher burnout and parents just letting their kids play and not be 'in school' in the summer.

So I think they're struggling and I think it depends on the commitments of the universities in which many of them are housed. And I think that's up in the air. And that worries me because it's actually these outside-of-school programs which, at least at this point, have done a better job of providing opportunities for children typically left out in school opportunities than schools have.

And we know from the talent development research, the kids benefit and need both. It's often only times in these summer programs that kids are with their intellectual peers. So we have competing forces for sure. And we're definitely not in a high point for gifted education, but we're in a period of a lot of change and turmoil and not necessarily just gifted, but education in general.

So I don't know where we'll be. And I feel like I'm just going to continue to fight and support and challenge what are, I think, incorrect assumptions about these kids.

**Cross** • *And it's really hard to anticipate all the changes that will happen, but hopefully many of them will be in the right direction for the right reasons. Your comments about the testing, I feel similarly that when used properly, I think the tests are... Daniel Patrick Monahan is such a good example of a test being used in a way that not only changed the young boy's life, but changed the world.*

*A single example that helped him get out of poverty and go on and get a world class education and go... I think he was a professor at Harvard for a while and a Congressperson, just such an impressive person. And the wisdom of a teacher and a test was the catapult for him. So as you're saying, being more sophisticated, maybe that's the key to this.*

*I want to mention a couple things kind of as fun. One of the things that I very much enjoyed is we've had opportunities say with NAGC to, in my case, follow you as president of NAGC at a time when you had, what's the right word, startled the world by being so proactively forthcoming and erudite about talent development at a time that people were in various stages of having interest in or understanding it.*

*And so in my opinion, you're speaking to it and writing about it at that time changed our world. And practically speaking, when I became president, there was resistance to even having a task force pursuing talent development. It was just an idea whose time was coming, and you (Rena and Frank) were the catalyst for that.*

**Olszewski-Kubilius** • *I stood on the shoulders of giants like Joyce and Carolyn Callahan and Don Treffinger and others who were saying similar things. Like I said, timing is everything. Right? If a field's not ready to receive a particular concept, it's not ready. So all I did was say it loudly and publicly. But also, I think the timing was right. But even then, Tracy, it's taken years, right? At least 10 years.*

**Cross** • *At least 10 years. And it was funny because as incoming president and as president, there were individual people who you and I both know, like and admire who were discouraging of me nudging that along.*

**Olszewski-Kubilius** • *Right. And that was the first time I really encountered, particularly from the parent groups, but also other educators, really intense feedback. Let's put it that way.*

**Cross** • *Certainly, you, Frank and Rena have really added to the literature on talent development in such a significant way that it has helped people like me who write an occasional piece on the topic. And in our case, we're situating it in school because that happens to be my particular passion.*

*I would argue that schools should aspire to helping all students reach their potential, including those who have extraordinary capacity to change the world, too. And to me, that's so honorable and difficult to argue against. Plus there are various techniques and things that we found to be beneficial that we fly under the flag of gifted education that have a place in that larger goal of maximizing potential of all students.*

**Olszewski-Kubilius** • Before I go, I want to say one last thing. So one of the things that's been so fun for me has been the work we've done to find out how talent develops in other fields. I've always been like you, focused on academics and school.

But for example, to talk about dance or acting or the culinary field or sport. So now, I read more articles about talent development in sport. I read one on judo the other day.

I don't even know what judo really is, but these niche talents, like drum corps, working with some folks in Germany who are interested in these niche areas, its

very interesting, and it's especially interesting to learn that some of these areas, these domains are much more deliberate about talent development, especially in the area of psychological and social skills than we are in academics, because they recognize how important that is to high achievement.

Anyway, so that's been really fun for me to learn about. I'm very interested now in different fields. I've read articles on medical students and stuff like that.

**Cross** • *Thank you, Paula, for sharing your professional history with us. It is greatly appreciated.*

## References

- Subotnik, R. F., Olszewski-Kubilius, P., & Worrell, F. C. (2011). Rethinking giftedness and gifted education: A proposed direction forward based on psychological science. *Psychological Science in the Public Interest*, 12(1), 3–54. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1529100611418056>

**Paula Olszewski-Kubilius, Ph.D.** is the director of the Center for Talent Development at Northwestern University and a professor in the School of Education and Social Policy. She has worked to create program models to meet the need of diverse gifted learners including online learning programs, summer, and weekend programs. She has written and published extensively about talent development for under-served gifted students. Her recent work includes *The Handbook of High Performance: Developing Potential into Domain-Specific Talent* with Rena Subotnik and Frank Worrell, and *Unlocking Potential: Identifying and Serving Gifted Students from Low-Income Households*, with Tamra Stambaugh.