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Abstract

The problem investigated in this study was the correlation, if any, between and among mean scores of various dimensions of self-concept and student self earned by 98 sixth grade public school students identified as gifted and nongifted. Findings suggested that dimensions of self-concept are not different in gifted and nongifted children, while dimensions of student self are different in gifted and nongifted children.
Table of Contents

Abstract .............................................................iii
Table of Contents ...................................................iv
List of Tables .........................................................vi
List of Figures .........................................................vii
Prologue ..............................................................viii
Chapter I .............................................................1
  Purpose of Study ..................................................2
  Definition of terms ...............................................2
  Hypothesis .........................................................5
  Methodology .......................................................6
    Subjects .........................................................6
    Instruments Used in this study ...............................9
  Procedure .......................................................11
  Statistical Treatment ...........................................13
  Summary .........................................................13
Chapter II ..........................................................15
  Review of Selected Literature .................................15
    Giftedness and Intelligence .................................16
    Self-Concept .................................................17
    Giftedness and Self-Concept ...............................24
    Giftedness, Underachievement, and Suicide ...............37
    Giftedness and Expectancies of Others ...................40
    Giftedness and Self Expectancies .........................44
  Summary .........................................................47
Chapter III ......................................................... 49
  Results of Data Analysis ................................. 49
  Summary ..................................................... 76
Chapter IV ......................................................... 78
  Discussion and Conclusions ............................... 78
    Self-Concept, Reflected Self, Ideal
    Self, and Others' Perceptions
    of the self ............................................. 79
  Student Self and Others' Perceptions
    as student .............................................. 83
  Implications for Future Study ......................... 93
  Questions For Parents and Teachers ................. 95
  Summary ..................................................... 96
Bibliography .................................................... 99
Appendices
  A  SPI--Self-concept ...................................... 110
  B  SPI--Student self ...................................... 112
  C  AT Program Curriculum ................................. 114
  D  Parent Permission Slip ............................... 115
  E  Administration and scoring of SPI ................. 116
  F  Validity of SPI ........................................ 117
  G  Permission to use Human Subjects in research
    data .................................................... 118
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Results of ANOVA, Self-concept on SPI</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Results of ANOVA, Reflected self—parent on SPI</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Results of ANOVA, Reflected self—teacher on SPI</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Results of ANOVA, Reflected self—classmate on SPI</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Results of ANOVA, Ideal self on SPI</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Results of ANOVA, Others' perception—parent on SPI</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Results of ANOVA, Others' perception—teacher on SPI</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Results of ANOVA, Others' perception—classmate on SPI</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Results of ANOVA, Student self on SPI</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Results of ANOVA, Others' perception as student—parent on SPI</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Results of ANOVA, Others' perception as student—teacher on SPI</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Results of ANOVA, Others' perception as student—classmate on SPI</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Summary of SPI variable Means and two way ANOVAS</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
List of Figures

1  Self-concept, means and
    standard deviations on SPI .................52
2  Reflected self--parent, means and
    standard deviations on SPI .................54
3  Reflected self--teacher, means and
    standard deviations on SPI .................56
4  Reflected self--classmate, means and
    standard deviations on SPI .................58
5  Ideal self, means and standard deviations ..60
6  Others' perception--parent, means and
    standard deviations on SPI .................62
7  Others' perception--teacher, means and
    standard deviations on SPI .................64
8  Others' perception--classmate, means and
    standard deviations on SPI .................66
9  Student self, means and
    standard deviations on SPI .................68
10 Others' perception as student--parent, means
    and standard deviations on SPI ............70
11 Others' perception as student--teacher, means
    and standard deviations on SPI ............72
12 Others' perception as student--classmate,
    means and standard deviations on SPI .......74
Prologue

A gifted child rebelling against unrealistic expectations of performance might sound like this:

I have a right to identify abilities and to excel.
I have a right to contribute to society.
I have a right to learn more in school than I knew last year.
I have a right to share my knowledge with others.
I have a right to develop my curiosity and creativity.
I have a right to apply what I learn through problem solving.
I have a right to make friends with gifted peers.
I have a right to contribute to growth of my peers.
I have a right to be different from my peers.
I have a right to respect and learn from others who differ from me.
I have a right to explore alternatives and to experience consequences.
I have a right to say how I might be freed from undue anxiety. (Anonymous, Dirkes, 1983).
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Chapter 1

Historically, achievements and idiosyncrasies of gifted persons have fascinated researchers and provided considerable incentive for study (Kretschmer, 1970). The brain of Einstein, the creativity of Mozart, the achievements of Da Vinci have been much studied by researchers (Clark, 1983).

The possibility of exceptional achievement and contribution by gifted persons has led to investigations by educators of methods to encourage that potential (Clark, 1983). But why and how are these people different? What can educators do to encourage persons of suspected outstanding potential to utilize their giftedness?

Certainly one avenue might be to look at that construct known as "self-concept" as attempts are made to explain why some students with high potential do achieve and others do not (Whitmore, 1980).
In addition, if, as Purkey (1970) claimed, this "self-concept" is modifiable, then educators must be encouraged to design and implement strategies intended specifically for positive modification of self.

Purpose of Study

The purpose of this study was threefold: 1) To determine if scores on a number of dimensions of self-concept earned by selected gifted students differed significantly from those earned by nongifted students; 2) to determine if a significant difference existed between scores reflecting expectancies of significant others for the gifted population and for the nongifted population; and 3) to determine the correlation, if any, between scores reflecting expectancies of significant others and the self-concept of selected gifted students and nongifted students.

Definition of Terms

Because there is much variation between and among definitions and interpretations of terms in the literature specific to gifted children (Richert, 1986), meanings of the major terms proposed for this study were surveyed; operational definitions meaningful to this investigation then were derived. Included for
definition were: Giftedness, self-concept, perceptions of significant others, and expectations.

**Giftedness**

For purposes of this study, giftedness was understood to mean that score on a nationally normed test which placed the student at or above the 98th percentile in the area of academic achievement. This position is compatible with that of both Gowan (1965) and Strang (1965) who would consider students placing in the top 2% on nationally-normed tests to be gifted and qualified for special programs.

While the generic term "gifted" was utilized in this study, and while all subjects met the criterion noted above, they, without exception, were drawn from a program intended for the Academically Talented (AT). While this is how the host District identifies its model, Gowan and Strang's position cited earlier would support the designation "gifted" since all students labeled AT would meet the stated "top 2 percent" criterion. The intellectually gifted would include, by and large, those classified as Academically Talented since qualification for the program entails placing at, or above, the 98th percentile on nationally normed tests including the Wide Range Achievement Test and the Wechsler Intelligence Test.
The AT program is an enrichment program designed to provide for special needs of intellectually gifted children (see Appendix C for a listing of curriculum included in the AT Program).

Self-Concept

In this investigation, dimensions of self-concept were understood to be represented by a specific score on the Soares and Soares Self Perception Inventory (1985) (SPI). Authors of the inventory have suggested that:

The self-concept has been used synonymously with self-appraisal, self-acceptance, self-image, self esteem, self-structure, self-identification, self-regard. But, if we define the concept of self like any concept--"an abstract ideal generalized from particular instances"--then the term "self-perception" seems most workable. Furthermore, since the self is crucially determined by the interaction of the self with other persons important to the self, the perceptions of self seem to be more feasible and, hence, more measurable. In other words, the self-concept is the system of perceptions formulated of the self in awareness of its distinctive existence.

The individual has perceptions of the self that could be summed up as generally "negative" or "positive," but perhaps more realistically a combination thereof. The individual attaches value to those perceptions of the self, comprising both positive and negative valences. As a result of those perceptions, the organism estimates the worth of the self as "higher" or "lower," rather than a baseline of nothingness, as Erikson might say. The individual also perceives the self as being "this" as opposed to "that", possessing more of one trait and less of another, and characterized by a special blend of qualities which make the individual distinctive and unusual while at the same time acceptable and significant. The self is a function of the environment and
others' perceptions of the individual. The individual internalizes perceptions others have of him/her, accepts or rejects them, and modifies, if applicable, his own self concept (pp. 10-11).

Perceptions of Significant Others and Expectations

Perceptions of significant others were understood to be represented by a score on the SPI--Others' Perception Form/parent, teacher or classmate. Perceptions are mental images, observation responses, or judgments that persons discern about others. Expectations are a basis for anticipation of behavior, provide a reason to consider actions probable, and can be derived from perceptions.

Hypothesis

As measured by the Soares and Soares Self Perception Inventory, there will be no significant difference between and among mean scores of gifted girls, gifted boys, nongifted girls, and nongifted boys when the variables are: Self-concept; reflected self/parent, teacher, classmate; ideal self; others' perception of the self/parent, teacher, classmate; Student self; others' perceptions as a student/parent, teacher, classmate.
Methodology

Subjects

The southwestern city in which the study took place has approximately 525,000 residents. Major sources of revenue include tourism, conventions, entertainment, casino-type gambling, major sporting events, education, and the military. Some 12,000,000 tourists and 8,000,000 conventioneers annually take advantage of these offerings.

The host school district, the nation's 24th largest, enrolls more than 100,000 students in 79 elementary schools, five sixth grade centers, four special education schools, 18 junior high schools, 12 senior high schools, and two technical centers. All socio-economic levels are reflected and the district employs more than 4000 teachers and 2000 support staff (Clark County School District, Zoning Department, November, 1987.)

From the total population of approximately 100,000 kindergarten through 12th graders, students at one sixth-grade center were utilized as subjects for this study because of the writer's particular interest in the wellbeing of students in this age range and because of the documented need for research on this population (Austin & Draper, 1981).
Within the host school district, sixth-grade centers were developed in response to the Supreme Court's school integration decision. According to this plan, all students in the district are bused to traditionally black community schools for their sixth-grade year. When a school's population is composed of 50% or more Black and/or other minorities, the school is designated a sixth-grade center. Minority students who normally would attend the designated sixth-grade centers then are bused to outlying traditionally white schools so that the sixth grades throughout the district reflect an ethnic balance (Clark County school District, Zoning Department, November, 1987).

From the sixth-grade center population of 3000, 100 students from one school were selected as subjects--50 gifted students and 50 nongifted students. The 50 gifted students reflected the selected school's entire population of students designated as Academically Talented. The nongifted students were drawn from two core classes whose teachers--one male and one female--were willing to participate in the study.

Core classes in sixth-grade centers reflect a time span of half the school day (3 hours), focusing upon reading, spelling, language arts, and writing during
that period. As one of their goals, core classes are intended to provide students with a transition from the self-contained classes of earlier elementary years to the changing of classes every period, characteristic of a junior high school setting. Within the host school, core classes were grouped heterogeneously, thus providing an appropriate control group for purposes of comparison.

Historically, the host district’s program for the Academically Talented has been in existence for 11 years and was developed to enrich students in the cognitive, affective, and creative domains of learning in such areas as leadership, problem solving, computers, research, etc. (See Appendix C for specific areas of inclusion). All students in the aforementioned core classes and AT class who returned permission slips were used as subjects for this study (See Appendix D for an example of the Parental Permission Slip).

Because results of studies of students within this age range differ as to whether or not self-concepts of boys and girls are equivalent (Austin & Draper, 1981), an equal representation of boys and girls was sought through utilization of students in existent classroom groups. The principal had tried to allow for equal
representation of males and females in each of these groupings.

**Instruments Used in this Study**

The Self Perception Inventory (SPI) is based on Anthony and Louise Soares' (1985) conceptualization of the emerging self and readily allows comparison of various perceptions of self-concept through its various scales:

A1 **Self-Concept**—how the individual sees self as person

A2 Ideal Concept—what kind of person the individual would like to be

A3 Reflected Self/parent—how the individual thinks a parent views him/her

A4 Reflected Self/teacher—how the individual thinks a teacher looks at him/her

A5 Reflected Self/classmate—how the individual thinks a classmate looks at him/her

B and C Others' Perceptions—Significant people in the individual’s life rate him/her on the same traits as those used to rate the self (both male and female scales)

B3 Masculine—parent perception

B4 Masculine—teacher perception

B5 Masculine—classmate perception

C3 Feminine—parent perception

C4 Feminine—teacher perception

C5 Feminine—classmate perception
D and E  Others' Perceptions (Student Self)--how others see the individual as a student (both male and female scales)

D1  Student Self--how the individual sees self as student

D3  Masculine--parent perception

D4  Masculine--teacher perception

D5  Masculine--classmate perception

E3  Feminine--parent perception

E4  Feminine--teacher perception

E5  Feminine--classmate perception

All letters followed by 1 or 2 are student self perceptions; all letters followed by 3 pertain to parents; by 4 to teachers; and by 5 to classmates.

A forced-choice type of instrument, the SPI contains four spaces of distance on 20 bipolar scales. This format allows both direction and intensity of response. The inventory is designed to measure evaluations along such dimensions as ego strength, calmness/serenity, adaptability, self sufficiency, and warmth/vibrancy. Except for person, that is, 1st, 2nd or 3rd, forms are almost identical, with changes made only for form-appropriateness, for example, I am happy, I wish I were happy, she is happy.

The SPI attempts to determine the perception of self--that picture which the individual thinks significant others have towards the individual--and the picture that others actually hold of the same
individual. From these scores then, the degree, or lack thereof, of congruence of self-ratings and other-ratings can be determined.

Instructions for administration and scoring of the Inventory are quite clear (See Appendix E for specific directions). Time required for completion of each portion of the inventory is relatively short, some 10 minutes (Buros, 1985 pp. 1351-1352).

Comparison of the SPI’s student form with Coopersmith’s Self Esteem Inventory yields a correlation of .68; with the Tennessee Self Concept Scale, .44; and the Multi-Rate Matrix/Self Concept, .89. Test-retest reliability ranges between .74 and .89, using 7 - 8 week intervals (For validity equivalents see Appendix F).

Generally speaking, the Soares is unique in that it provides insight into the self from a variety of perspectives and is readily administered, completed and scored (Buros, 1985).

Procedures
1. **Permission obtained from School District.** This was accomplished by a letter from the writer to appropriate personnel in the school district (See Appendix G for letter).
2. **Permission obtained from school.** The writer spoke with the administrator of the sixth grade center where
the study was to be conducted to discuss procedures, gain approval of the parent letter, anticipate problems, and to identify and finalize other necessary arrangements.

3. **Cooperation of teachers obtained.** The writer discussed the project with several core teachers to ascertain who was interested in participating with the project and to obtain their commitment.

4. **Parent permission to test their child.** The writer visited classrooms of participating teachers to enlist student help with obtaining parental permission to test by asking parents to sign the permission form.

5. **Inventories administered to students.** Following receipt of parental permission, and strictly following procedures for administration as set forth by the authors, SPIs were administered by the writer to nongifted subjects in their core classes and to AT students in their AT classes. All inventories were administered within a period of two weeks.

6. **Inventories gathered in one place.** A file for each subject containing inventories pertaining to that subject and permission to test signed by parent was maintained by the writer. Each student was assigned a number for the purposes of confidentiality.

7. **Inventories hand scored** All inventories were handscored by the author.
8. **Analyses of results** This was facilitated by accessing a special computerized program under the direction of the writer's Research Advisor.

**Statistical Treatment**

The collected data were analyzed by application of two-way ANOVAS under the direction of the writer's Research Advisor.

**Summary**

The purpose of this study was to examine the self-concept scores of 50 gifted and 50 nongifted students, all within a sixth-grade center setting, and utilizing the Soares and Soares Inventory. In addition, and relative to both groups of subjects, expectations of significant others (parent, teacher, classmate) were studied by means of analysis of results generated by the same instrument. This was done to determine if there were positive correlations between self-concepts and expectations of significant others for gifted and nongifted children.

Subjects for the study were enrolled in sixth grade, a level of special interest to the researcher essentially because these students are moving toward adolescence, a particularly crucial time in the
development of self concept (Soares & Soares, 1985, p. 12).

Results were analyzed by application of two-way ANOVAS under the direction of the writer's Research Advisor in order to accept or reject the null hypothesis.
Chapter II

Review of Selected Literature

Historically, maladjustment and oftentimes madness has been associated with the gifted. The lives of men such as Plato, Newton, and Michelangelo have been much studied (Gemant, 1961; Kretschmer, 1970). More recently, concern that gifted children are not utilizing their intellectual potential has spurred research as to causes thereof, along with means to assist these gifted students. In fact, a congressional study has endorsed the concern of educators that gifted children may face unrealistic expectations and a resultant decrease in self-concept, leading to loss of potential accomplishment and contributions to mankind (CLEW, 1972; Whitmore, 1983).

To facilitate the orderly presentation of research findings relative to gifted children, the following categorical sequencing has been followed:

Giftedness and Intelligence;
Self-Concept;
Giftedness and Self-Concept;
Giftedness, Underachievement, and Suicide
Giftedness and Expectancies of Others; and
Giftedness and Self Expectancies

Giftedness and Intelligence

Over the years, a variety of approaches has been employed when trying to delineate parameters for the term "giftedness." Among these would be that giftedness is:

1. The two percent who score highest on a test of intelligence (Terman, 1925; Strang, 1960; Gowan, 1965);

2. ...(an) outstanding trait of mental superiority (Gold, 1965);

3. Outstanding abilities that allow those who possess them to be capable of high performance (U.S. Education Commission, 1971);

4. Advanced skills, imagination, insight and intense interest or involvement (Office of Ed., 1972);

5. One or two standard deviations above the normal in intelligence quotient (Gallagher, 1975);

6. Forms of psychological overexcitability including psychomotor, sensual, imaginative, intellectual, and emotional (Dabrowski, 1977);

7. Excelling markedly in the ability to think, reason, judge, invent, or create. Areas may include: General intellectual abilities, specific academic aptitude, creative or productive thinking, leadership ability, visual or performing arts, and psychomotor ability (Karnes & Collins, 1978);

8. The feeling and imagination together with higher intellectual abilities required for creative potential (Plechowski, 1979);
9. An exceptionality and deviation from the norm (Alvino, 1981);

10. The capacity for superior achievement in any socially valuable area of human endeavor (Passov, 1981);

11. An advanced and accelerated brain function (Clark, 1983);

12. ... not ... that these individuals' worth rests in their superior mental abilities and that having a fine mind is all they are. Gifted youth are not disembodied brains. They have strong and subtle emotions (Kaplan, 1982) and;

13. The potential for becoming critically acclaimed performers or exemplary producers of ideas in spheres of activity that enhance the moral, physical, emotional, social, intellectual, or aesthetic life of humanity (Feldhusen & Hoover, 1986).

While other interpretations and definitions exist, all would seem to be similar to those just cited. When considered collectively, the majority include terms for superiority or acceleration of traits or mental function, demonstrating the need for a researcher to include an "above normal intellectual potential" in any definition of giftedness.

Self-Concept

The term "self-concept" has been of vital concern to researchers and educators alike since studies of personality began in the early 1900s with James initial psychological analysis of that construct (Damon, 1983, p. 11). In fact, Epstein (1973) suggested "self-concept" to be the most central concept in all of
psychology. In addition, researchers such as James, Baldwin, Freud, Rogers, Maslow and Erikson have contributed to the current understanding and definition of the term and its word variants, such as self-esteem (Damon, 1983; Clark, 1983).

James, often called the "Father of Modern Psychology" (Liebert & Spiegler, 1978), distinguished between the me—representing the known parts of the person (material, social and spiritual) and determined, in large part, by what others think of the person—and the "I"—representing the stable part of personality, the knower which organizes and interprets the quality of personal experiences. James would have one believe that the "me" may change from situation to situation; the "I," however, assures unimpeachable individuality and exercises free will, having knowledge of the many experiences of the past, not just the present, as does the "me." The "I" thus enables a person to be free from relying absolutely on others' views for one's sense of self (Damon, 1983, pp. 10-13).

Similarly, Baldwin (1902) asserted that children come to know themselves only as a consequence of social interactions with others. According to his theory, development of a child's personality continues only with constant modification of the sense of self through suggestions of others (Damon, 1983, pp. 4-5).
Commenting on Baldwin's assumption, Damon (1983) claimed that, although overstated, it helped explain later connections between the individual's academic and emotional development and his social self (p. 11).

In earlier writings, particularly in the creation of personality's three aspects—id, ego, and superego—Freud (1930) highlighted the struggle between the development of self and society's expectations. The "id" would represent instinctual drives (desires), the "ego" would refer to reality demands (the rational) and the "superego" would reflect moral society's restraints (the ideal). Conflict between and among the three potentially could cause behavioral disturbance. A conflict-free person, according to Freud, would be coping successfully with his/her inner desires and the outer expectations of society and would experience a positive self concept (Liebert and Spiegler, 1978, pp. 97-111).

In agreement with Freud, Rogers (1959) observed that a reconciliation of what a person is and what (s)he thinks (s)he should be results in a more positive self concept (real self to ideal self). This would involve the person's perception of relationships to others and the value (s)he assigned those relationships. According to Rogers, the self actualized person moves toward maintenance and
enhancement of self; the healthier the individual, the more conflict-free movement there is toward self actualization and a positive self concept (pp. 200-204). Further, Rogers (1961) is of the opinion that the beliefs one has literally determine his actions and perceptions of the world and other people. From these beliefs he constructs his own reality and self-concept.

As did Rogers, Maslow (1963) developed a theory of self actualization. Unlike other self-concept researchers, however, Maslow worked with optimal or fully functioning persons (his admired teachers) in a case-study manner. To Maslow, a self actualized person is characterized by: An efficient perception of reality; an acceptance of self, others and nature; spontaneity; and problem centeredness (pp. 527-551). All are characteristics which encourage a sense of competence within the individual as a specific heirarchy of needs is resolved: Physical; safety; love and belonging; self esteem; self actualization; and transcendence. Again, Maslow's healthy person would be one who successfully has integrated his/her own expectations with those of society.

Erickson (1968) developed a list of crises that had to be resolved by the individual in order
for him/her to become a self actualized person. He would view positive identity formation as resulting from successful resolution of these dominant crises: Trust versus mistrust; autonomy versus shame and doubt; initiative versus guilt; industry versus inferiority; identity versus role diffusion; intimacy versus isolation; generativity versus stagnation; and integrity versus despair (p. 94).

There would be others who have contributed to the present understanding of the term "self-concept," also. Wylie (1968) viewed a number of features incorporated into the self-concept. These would include: A distinct entity from others; a continuing to be the same person over time; the person's own experiencing of his/her physical features; past experiences, especially voluntary and controllable ones; organization and unity among the various parts of the self; evaluations, thoughts and memories; and varying degrees of consciousness or unconsciousness. For Purkey (1970), the self-concept is a complex system of beliefs that an individual holds to be true about himself. It is organized and can be modified. All social encounters play a role in development of the self-concept—first, family, then school, friends, church, and so forth. Self-concept is learned through interaction. Because of the importance of interaction with others in
formation of self-concept (Clark, 1983), school plays an enormous role. During much of the formation of the self-concept, peer interaction becomes of major importance to students.

Others would define self-concept as: 1.) The sense of worth that allows an individual to make discoveries freely as well as recognize love and purpose (Ellsworth, 1974; Felker, 1974); 2.) The part of the personality that carries out psychological acts (Liebert & Spiegler, 1978); and 3.) The organized configuration of perceptions of self which are admissible to awareness. It is composed of one's characteristics and abilities, the perceptions and concepts of the self in relation to others and to the environment, social phenomenon, arising and developing in a social context; a continual product or social interaction with others (Coleman & Fults, 1982).

In a somewhat different vein, Damon (1981) suggests that high self-concept correlates with life satisfaction and happiness and is connected to mental health through life. Further, Damon maintains that a sense of control over self and the world is perhaps the central dimension to self-concept and esteem.

That it is a dynamic set of beliefs which the individual holds true about himself is the position of Clark (1983), who goes on to note that, in part, these
beliefs are constructed as a result of interactions carried on with others. This system set is organized and can be modified (p. 35).

Finally, Soares and Soares (1985) may have stated it best when they observed:

the self-concept cannot be directly observed; its existence must be inferred from behavior that can be seen or from the self report that an individual gives of the self. Self-concept, therefore is a construct. It has been used synonymously with self-appraisal, self-acceptance, self-image, and self-esteem, self-structure, self-identification, and self-regard. Of these, self perception seems most workable. The self is crucially determined by the interaction of the self with other persons that are important to the self (p. 9).

In addition to the aforementioned contributors to the delineation of the term "self-concept," Clark (1983) suggested a list of others who have brought the concept of self back to psychology after years of abandonment: Allport; Aspy; Brookover; Coombs; Coopersmith; Jersild; Journard; May; Purkey; and Snygg (p. 108). All arrived at definitional positions compatible with their personal theoretical framework; all used "self-concept" to explain the why and how of human behavior.

From these descriptions, then, the self-concept is the construction of a belief system by the individual, concerning the individual. This formation occurs through interaction with others and the positive resolution of conflicts concerning others' perceptions.
Release of potential needed for responsibility, purpose, and love may then occur. In other words, the developing child must not feel overly concerned about his/her own worth to him/herself and to others; instead, (s)he must believe in his/her worth for release of energies necessary to serve his/her potential and the like purposes (s)he has chosen.

**Giftedness and Self-Concept**

While juxtaposition of the terms "giftedness" and "poor self-concept" seem contradictory, researchers claim this to be so. Strang (1960) asserted that mentally gifted students may be more inclined to have emotional problems than are normal children. In a similar vein, Burt (1970) claimed that an innate degree of general intelligence above normal is apparently a more effective cause of maladjustment than an innate degree below. Further, Klein and Cantor (1976) hold that being gifted does not guarantee a positive self-concept.

Among the highly gifted, Schauer (1976) contends that a greater tendency to suffer from emotional instability may exist. Swassing (1985) likewise suggests that there may be a higher incidence of emotional problems and poor self-concepts among gifted children than among nongifted children. Kitano and Kirby (1986) reiterate that possessing intelligence
above a maximum (150 IQ) may be a social liability, and characterizing all gifted children as having high self-concepts and superior social concepts is not true.

Other researchers direct caution when linking self-concept and IQ. Perrone, Karshner, and Mole (1979) observe that the other side of the "you can be anything" message is that the gifted individual fails to develop a realistic sense of limitations and deficiencies. Manaster and Powell (1983) stress that uniqueness can breed loneliness and self-contempt, and Tannenbaum (1983) that self-concept and IQ assess different parts of human potential. Further, Janos, Fung, and Robinson (1985) point out that awareness of one's own intellectual superiority and atypical interest patterns diminishes self-esteem.

In addition, empirical studies comparing self-concepts of gifted and nongifted children have been inconsistent as to whether or not gifted children's self-concepts are equal, superior, or inferior to nongifted children (Karnes & Wherry, 1981; Maddux, Scheibe, & Bass, 1982; Altman, 1983; Coleman & Fults, 1983; Kelly & Colangelo, 1984; Janos, Fung, & Robinson, 1985; Loeb & Jay, 1987).

When investigating profiles of gifted individuals, a Senate Subcommittee's report noted that 30 percent of 60 bright high achievers had serious emotional problems
Klein and Cantor (1976) conducted a study of 38 children from kindergarten to fourth grade whose IQs were 130 or above. Using the Coopersmith Scale and the Piers Harris to measure self-concepts, they found that intellectual giftedness did not necessarily lead to high self-esteem and that more gifted children in kindergarten than their non-gifted kindergarten schoolmates manifested poor self-esteem (p. 99).

The study was conducted at a school where 38 of the 92 students from kindergarten through fourth grade were found to be gifted and subsequently were utilized as subjects. The population had a large number of high IQ children; perhaps even the control group was so, thus altering the normal population for comparison. In addition, as noted above, the Piers Harris (PH) was one of the instruments used for measurement. Janos and Robison (1985) point to evidence from other researchers suggesting that norms for the PH significantly may underestimate the scores of middle class children not identified as gifted (p. 161). Thus it is possible that self-concept scores for the gifted students may have been skewed more positively when compared with the nongifted group.

Bracken (1980) studied the self attitudes of 78 intellectually gifted children enrolled in a two week
program at a southeastern university. Mean chronological age of the subjects was 9.8; mean grade placement was 5.3; and an IQ of 120 was the lower limit for placement in the program. The comparison group of the nongifted sample (n=99) was enrolled in regular education classrooms. All subjects responded to questionnaires which measured self-concept, attitude toward learning, and peer relationships, each of which was developed and normed by the Institute for Development of Education Activities. Results were validated by a Multi-Trait-Multi-Method procedure using teachers' and peers' ratings in a correlational matrix. Bracken noted:

The attitudes of gifted children differ significantly from their nongifted peers in one area that separates these two groups directly—learning. The two areas which are less directly related to academic success—self-concept and peer relations—are less favorably reflected by gifted children, suggesting that the attitudes developed through academic success are not necessarily generalized to other nonacademic areas (p. 717).

The number in this study was not as small as in the 1976 study by Klein and Cantor; however, it must be noted that Bracken also used tests which were not nationally normed.

On a similar note, Ross and Parker (1980) utilized 147 fifth through eighth grade students indentified as gifted (top 2 percent on Otis Lennon or Henmon-Nellson
and achievement scores on Iowa Test of Basic Skills or Science Research Associates) to ascertain if these students possessed significantly higher academic than social self concepts. The Sears Self-Concept Inventory was self-administered as part of a larger take-home assessment package. Other questions addressed were: 1) Whether or not self-concept scores were influenced by sex differences; and 2) whether or not the difference, if any, between social and academic self-concepts would increase over time.

Results showed a significantly higher academic than social self-concept for the gifted students. There were no sex differences in either social or academic self-concept scales and the discrepancy between social and academic self-concept did not appear to change over time. Ross and Parker suggested a longitudinal study, rather than cross sectional data, to test the third hypothesis (p. 8). The fact that the tests were take home and self administered may have influenced results of this study.

Karnes and Wherry (1981) found no significant differences in self-concepts among grades, between sexes, or between gifted students who were enrolled or not enrolled in gifted programs. However, a significantly higher self-concept was found for gifted students when compared to the norm group when utilizing
the Piers Harris scale. Of the 153 subjects in the
gifted sample, 90 were enrolled in a gifted program; 58
were not. The 77 girls and 76 boys had completed
grades four through seven. Intelligence Quotient
scores of 120 or above on an individual measure of
intelligence (WISC R. or Stanford Binet) were used to
determine giftedness (pp. 903-904).

Lehman and Erdwins (1981) focused on the emotional
and social development of the younger gifted child,
attempting to discern if gifted children were more like
their chronological or mental age mates in the
emotional and social spheres of their lives. This was
done by comparing 16 very bright third graders with 16
nongifted third graders and 16 nongifted sixth graders
on the California Test of Personality (Form AA) and the
Children's Social Attitude and Value Scales. The
Stanford-Binet scores of the gifted students ranged
from 141 to 165. They were in classrooms with equally
bright children of similar chronological age. The two
average IQ groups (IQ range 90-110) were selected by
their principals and attended elementary and middle
schools in a suburban county adjoining the one in which
the gifted children resided. Mean chronological ages
in years and months for the gifted group was 8-6; for
the nongifted third graders, 8-11; and the nongifted
sixth graders, 12-8. An equal representation in number
of boys and girls was sought in each of the three samples.

In general, Lehman and Erdwins found that gifted students differed less from their mental-age mates than from their chronological age mates on measures of personal and social adjustment. Differences were not consistent, however. On some scales, the gifted children performed more like their CA mates; on others like their MA mates, and on yet others, like neither. Overall, the gifted children were quite well adjusted and even scored higher than the MA group on some scales (pp. 135-136).

While Lehman and Erdwins affirmed that testing was well supervised, the design was contaminated because the gifted children were tested individually at home after school hours, while the average IQ children were tested in small groups at school (p. 134). Lehman and Erdwins claim the gifted had more distractions at home, even though the testing was done in a more familiar environment.

In two studies, Coleman and Fults (1982, 1983) noted that self-concept is a social construct and children's self perceptions are influenced by the social environment in which they reside (1982, p. 16). Within the regular classroom, gifted children's
abilities are exceptional; within the gifted classroom, typical.

In such transition from a "regular" classroom to a "gifted classroom", social comparison theory would suggest that self-concept might diminish. Festinger (1954), in particular, speculated that, in the absence of objective standards of comparison, people will employ others in their environment as the basis for forming estimates of self-worth. Also, given the choice of relatively similar or disimilar others, similar individuals are more likely to be selected as a basis for social comparison and, inevitably, as agents influencing the formation of self-concept.

In both the Coleman and Fults studies, researchers found that gifted children in gifted classrooms scored lower than gifted children in regular classrooms on the Piers Harris Scales. In addition, these researchers found no significant differences in self-concept scores between boys and girls in either study (p. 47).

In the 1982 Coleman and Fults study, 90 subjects randomly were selected from the 500 students in the gifted program. Using the same sampling procedure, 90 additional students were selected from the residual pool of children who were nominated for the program but had not been chosen and, therefore, remained in regular classrooms. All 180 students were above the 90th
percentile on achievement test results. Gifted students in the program sample had a mean IQ of 136, while 118 was the mean for the nonprogram students. All subjects were in grades four, five or six. The study was longitudinal in that students were tested three times: October, '79; May, '80; and April, '81. In terms of results, gifted children in the gifted program showed significantly lower self-concept scores; however, after returning to the regular classrooms, the "program" children's self-concept increased perceptibly (p. 118). Apparently, changing the gifted children's comparison group, that is, from other gifted children back to normal children also increased self-concept since the gifted children once again viewed themselves to be brighter when compared to the normal population of children.

For their 1983 study, Coleman and Fults had a sample of 99 fourth grade gifted students who left their regular classroom to attend a gifted program one day a week. Mean IQ was 135 (Academic Aptitude, McGraw Hill, 1970) with achievement levels over the 96th percentile for total achievement. The Piers Harris was administered during Fall and Spring of academic years 1980-81 and 1981-82. To contrast the self-concept scores of higher versus lower IQ gifted students, the sample was divided at the mean total IQ for the entire
group. Data were analyzed to determine self-concept differences between girls and boys, to observe score differences as they related to levels of intelligence, and to view changes in self-concept as a function of passage of time. No significant difference was found between girls’ and boys’ self-concept scores.

High IQ students in the gifted classroom showed higher self-concepts than their somewhat less capable classmates. Self-concepts of higher IQ students increased with length of time in the program, while Piers Harris scores for lower IQ students declined to some extent. Piers Harris scores of both groups were higher than the PH norms for average children.

Contradictorily, Maddux, Scheiber, and Bass (1982) found no evidence to suggest that identification or placement in segregated or integrated programs might result in lower self-concepts in gifted fifth and sixth grade children, as measured by the Piers Harris. In addition, each child in the Maddux, Scheiber, and Bass study also took a researcher-designed sociometric instrument which indicated how (s)he felt about sitting next to others in that class. Students were selected for the gifted program via IQ scores, achievement test scores, and teacher referral. Subjects (mean IQ 128) were 110 gifted students—21 in an integrated gifted program, 34 in a segregated gifted program, and 55
gifted students who were not in a gifted program. Piers Harris scores of the gifted children were compared with national norms for average children and with each other. Results suggested that sixth grade gifted students had higher self-concepts than average, while no difference was found at fifth grade level. Once again, the PH, as well as a researcher-designed test, was used.

Kelly and Colangelo (1984) found that gifted students hold significantly higher academic and social self-concepts when compared with their nongifted age mates. They asserted that a definite relationship exists between academic ability and academic and social self concepts. Subjects for this study were 57 gifted students, 25 remedial students and 184 general students in grades seven through nine. The Tennessee Self-Concept Scale and Academic Self-Testing Concept Scale were used as testing measures. No significant sex differences were found relative to self-concept (p. 552), while doing well academically and having a positive social self-concept varied directly (p. 552).

Janos, Fung and Robison (1985) extended the notion that gifted children who feel "different" from other children would have lower self-concepts than those who did not feel "different." Subjects for the study were 271 children, aged 5.6 to 10.6 years, with a mean IQ of
140, and who participated in a longitudinal study for early identification of intellectual precocity. Measures used with the children were the PH, a questionnaire concerning friendships and, lastly, a question about whether or not the gifted children felt "different" from other children. Parents completed four questionnaires: Child Behavior Checklist, Survey Form of the Vineland Adaptive Behavior Scales, Family Environment Scale, and a follow-up questionnaire concerning their child's academic record and satisfaction therewith. All measures used were mailed to participants and filled out without the help of staff members. All parents responded to the follow-up questionnaire; 87 percent completed the CBS; 88 percent the Vineland.

Eighty-three percent of the children completed the PH, 98 percent the friendship questionnaire, 88 percent gave their perceptions of differentness, or lack thereof, between themselves and their age mates. Of 238 children who responded to the "different" question, 88 (37 percent) thought of themselves as different, showed a lower self-concept score on the PH than did other gifted students in the study, and reported more difficulty in relationships with age mates; however, their parents did not describe them as exhibiting more behavioral problems. There were no sex differences
found in self-concepts; and self-concepts of the
gifted children were above the PH norms for children
not considered gifted.

Participants of this study were not typical of
gifted children "at large" but were more representative
of those whose parents volunteer for and remain
involved with research and service ventures aiding the
gifted population (pp. 79-81).

Loeb and Jay (1987) compared 125 gifted children
with 102 nongifted control subjects in grades 4-6 on
three measures—self-concept, locus of control, and
satisfaction with self. Data concerning the children
also were collected from their mothers and teachers.
The researchers observed that giftedness seemed to be
an advantage for girls, but not for boys. Gifted girls
described themselves as having a more positive
self-concept and a more internal locus of control than
did nongifted girls. No such differences were found
with boys; in fact, gifted boys gave some evidence of
lower self-satisfaction, particularly in areas of
physical strength and aggressiveness, when compared
with nongifted boys. Teachers generally rated the
gifted children as having fewer problems in all areas
in comparison to nongifted students (pp. 9-11).

Loeb and Jay also did an extensive review of
self-concept studies involving gifted children and
claimed that inconsistent results may have occurred due to differences among subject samples, measures employed and decisions concerning data analysis. They suggested that future studies should not rely solely on self-report measures but, rather, should include teacher and parent ratings, as well as measures of ideal and real self-concept (p. 10).

In addition to poor self-concepts, two other negative phenomena have been associated with giftedness and self-concept: Underachievement (Whitmore, 1983) and suicide (Lajoie and Shore, 1981).

Giftedness, Underachievement, and Suicide

Researchers have illustrated that a disproportionate number of students with high potential are not achieving at a level consistent with their ability.

Underachievement.

At the high school level, Strang (1965) observed that, at one suburban senior high school, 49 percent of students with IQs over 130 (n=45) were underachievers; in another, 58 percent of the school's gifted students were underachieving.

Cooley (1960) utilized data from Project Talent and further showed that nearly one-fifth of gifted high school students did not enter college and 13 percent did not even aspire to do so. In addition, the study
noted that significant numbers of the most gifted high school students were failing to achieve.

Green's data (1962) revealed that more than 17 percent of gifted students in all states were actually dropping out of school.

According to CLPW (1972) statistics, gifted students have the highest secondary school dropout rate of all students and more slow learners graduate from high school than gifted ones.

Gowan (1965) has described two California schools: one whose gifted population (7 percent of total population) had a 42 percent underachievement level, and another with a gifted population of 2 percent which had a 16 percent achievement level.

Nyquist (1973) reported that 55 percent of New York's gifted children (elementary and secondary) were underachievers and that 19 percent of high school dropouts were gifted.

Freehill (1961) has quoted a San Diego study by LeHew which found 8 percent of elementary and 15 percent of secondary gifted children to be underachievers.

While the gifted population ranges from two to five percent of the general population, these studies suggest that the dropout rate for gifted and the rate
of underachievement among gifted students are larger than that for nongifted students.

**Suicide.**

In addition to underachievement, suicide has been linked with giftedness. Johnson (1981) has claimed that there are many reasons why gifted students may be more susceptible than nongifted children to suicide: 1) Rapid learning—gifted students learn quickly and often are rewarded for a small amount of work; this may result in a success depression that occurs in persons who are unjustly rewarded (Kaiser & Berndt; 1985, p. 74); 2) a questioning nature—this may cause conflict with teachers when gifted children constantly ask "why?" 3) perfectionism, or feelings of not having done their best; 4) oversensitivity to criticism by significant others; and 5) feelings that chronological peers with average intellectual potential consider gifted students "weird."

McCants (1985) has identified two concerns which may cause the gifted child to experience greater conflict with his/her environment: 1) Gifted students exhibit more dominance, forcefulness, independence and competetiveness; and 2) gifted students are capable of manipulating their parents, who often have difficulty controlling their gifted children (p. 28).
Lerouz (1985) talked with eight families of gifted children who had committed suicide. Generally, these parents noted that their children found difficulty with a) nonconformity and individuality, b) fear of reality and c) suicidal behavior of a friend shortly before the tragic happenings (p. 78).

**Giftedness and Expectancies of Others**

While much has been written concerning self concept, giftedness and attending problems, the importance and role of expectations for gifted students is a relatively new field of inquiry. Researchers have offered cause-effect statements concerning the exaggerated expectations placed on gifted students by parents, teachers and peers and resultant inordinate amounts of pressure felt by gifted students.

As early as 1947, Terman contended that gifted students felt more pressure to excel, go to college, and get good grades. Kaiser and Berndt (1983) reiterated that high social and intellectual demands often are placed on the gifted. Clark (1983) cautions that schools' labeling of a child as gifted increases expectations of that child by teachers, peers, parents and self, oftentimes to an unattainable level. While Whitmore (1980) emphasizes that continual peer comparisons with self often cause frustration.
Further, Bracken (1980) has pointed out that gifted children's self-concepts are greatly affected by how others perceive and react to special abilities. Nelson-Graw (1985) has suggested that gifted children are expected to be different from the rest of the family.

Oftentimes, gifted children's identity is dependent only on their abilities. Roeper (1982) has claimed that gifted and talented children are expected by themselves, as well as parents and teachers, to be perfect. Thusly, gifted children may be loved and supported only for their "gifts."

Likewise, Swassing (1985) has asserted that maladjustment may be exaggerated when parents, teachers, and gifted children themselves have unrealistic expectations when assuming that advanced abilities in one area automatically mean advanced abilities in all areas. Safter and Cramond (1982) concurred that gifted children are expected to be good at every subject, not just one or two, and expectations of them are such that their being is confused with the skill. Tomer (1981) contends that parents, teachers, and important others expect gifted children to be right all of the time when, in reality, they must have the right to be wrong.
According to other researchers, frustration is caused in gifted children when they strive to secure adult approval. Ross and Parker (1980) stress that gifted children's focus on academic over social development probably reflects the disproportionate amount of attention rendered for scholastic over social excellence by significant adult figures within the school setting. For these students, academic performance likely has served as one of the surest avenues of securing adult approval.

Further, Klein and Cantor (1976) believe that gifted children may still be investing considerable emotional energy in pleasing parents and parental figures and lack the confidence and security to move away readily.

In addition, Dirkes (1983) has speculated that some parents and teachers seek fulfillment through their children. These adults anticipate that the young will benefit from their good wishes. The children want to please and are then expected to live up to former successes. When nothing but the best is good enough, the highest of goals is established, whether or not it is appropriate to the individual. As external goals increase in number and importance, intrinsic motivation lessens as it is replaced by others' expectations.
It is Johnson's position (1985) that, when gifted students become too outstanding, they run the risk of being exploited by adults (to do adult tasks) or rejected by classmates. Gifted children may become overextended and find it hard to say "no" because of the fear of losing accepted uniqueness to adults. These adult-like levels of competence may cause problems when gifted students are expected to be mature in all arenas and subjects. If (s)he fails to do so, both adult and child are disappointed.

Janos, Fung and Robinson (1985) have asserted that gifted children unfortunately may be caught in a subtle trap because, in many ways, they are socialized to capitalize on their superiority, but alienation awaits mismanagement of that task. That self expectations of the gifted child, when coupled with those of parents, teachers, peers, and others, may cause an emotional overload is the contention of Brady-Kegley (1984).

Finally, Soares and Soares (1985) may have stated it best by their observation that

this concept of self is maintained by an intermittent schedule of reinforcement which then makes that self highly resistant to extinction. That organism is reinforced by others who are similar, others who are considered emotionally and cognitively important to the individual, others who are identification models of behavior, and by itself, when choosing those behaviors which endorse the self as it has evolved. Because the organism judges itself within the social context that others judge that individual, the larger
social environment does not pose a threat of change to the self, especially if the valuations made by people in that larger world are inconsistent with what the organism has come to believe about itself. Only when the organism defines the self against the larger world or attaches meaning to its self concept within a more heterogeneous society might it regard their perceptions as decisive or conclusive.

The self-esteem of an individual can suffer generally in four ways: 1) if the organism finds itself unacceptable to significant people in the immediate environment; 2) if it does not receive acceptance in the larger world, especially crucial if the individual has not achieved acceptance at the first level of significant others; 3) when expectations of its behavior change and the organism begins to have doubts about its acceptability or competence to handle the problems of living; and 4) when the different segments of other—especially parents and peers—are at variance with one another as to the worth of the individual (pp. 11-12).

Giftedness and Self Expectancy

All too often, researchers claim, gifted students misinterpret, internalize, or exaggerate expectations of significant others. The results are often unrealistic expectations of themselves.

Trotter (1971), for example, has claimed that parents of gifted children often expect too much; these children internalize the expectations; then the expectations they place on themselves can become more demanding than any external pressure. Further, Fraiser and McCannon (1981) have stated that gifted students expect to be bored and expect to do better academically than other students and that this, many times, leads to unrealistic expectations of themselves.
Continuing, Roeper (1982) asserts that many gifted children become perfectionists and remain so as adults. They do not give themselves permission to fail in anything they undertake, particularly in whatever they define as their specific field of competency. To fail is a right for others, but not for themselves; their emotional need is to be perfect. This, of course, is an unrealistic demand. Roeper further states that it is normal for the young child to feel omnipotent, the gifted child may carry this feeling of omnipotence beyond the normal stage. While other children discover the limits of their power and ability by trial and error, gifted children are often able to fulfill their wishes without severe limitations. These children are admired for being special and their parents are often in awe of them. The children misinterpret their parents’ behavior, which is constantly reinforced by the children’s ability to manipulate the environment more successfully than an average child can do. It therefore becomes their mandate to accomplish anything they want to do.

If, however, gifted children find that they are unable to live up to these expectations, they consider it to be their personal fault rather than a realistic limitation of their age and ability. They often feel pressured and guilty whenever failure occurs which
leads to feeling inferior, for there are many such occasions when they cannot meet their own goals (Roeper, 1982, p. 22).

Clark (1983) maintains that the frustration of never living up to one's own expectations and standards can be very self-defeating and interfere with mental and emotional growth. Continuing, she has claimed that one reason for this (lower self-concepts than average children) could be associated with the unusually high expectations the gifted have for themselves.

Parents of gifted children, sometimes accused of "pushing" their children, actually are more concerned because their children seem to push themselves unrealistically. This pressure can be far more demanding than any external pressure. Parents and teachers need to be aware of self-expectation so that they can provide help for the gifted child in acquiring more realistic goals and adequate coping behavior (Clark, 1983, p. 108).

Kaplan (1983) has claimed that without an accurate and realistic self-concept, many gifted youths create emotional difficulties for themselves which prevent them from fully using their talents in constructive or satisfying ways. Specifically, gifted youth frequently misunderstand what giftedness actually means in their lives, hold unrealistically high
expectations for their own achievement, confuse the means and ends of their accomplishments, overvalue their cognitive dimensions at the expense of their affective natures, or view giftedness as an entitlement (Kaplan, 1983, p. 75).

Kitano and Kirby (1986) reiterate Kaplan's position, claiming that experience has dictated that some gifted children have difficulty forming realistic self-appraisals, often setting high expectations for themselves, and becoming frustrated when they do not achieve their goals. Finally, that the gifted have a high potential for self inflicted misery resulting from the discrepancy between the ideal self for which they strive and the real self which they achieve is the position of Loeb and Jay (1987).

Summary

From this review of research important elements would seem to be 1) that expectations of gifted children come from many significant others such as parents, teachers and peers; 2) that expectations of gifted children often are high because of the misconstruence of labeling children as gifted; and 3) that gifted children often accept these expectations as their own and expect too much of themselves. As a result, their intrinsic motivation may suffer.
Gifted children need help in gaining a balanced view of their own worth in a social, as well as an intellectual, context (Janos, Fung, and Robinson, 1985).
Chapter III

Results of Data Analysis

As reported in Tables 1 through 12 and Figures 1 through 12, results of the analysis of variance with repeated measures reflect scores of gifted girls, gifted boys, nongifted girls and nongifted boys (independent variables) on the 12 dependent variables noted in the hypothesis on page five.

The interaction of giftedness, sex, or both with the 12 dependent variables possibly could have resulted in 36 significant effects. However, only seven of the 36 possibilities showed significance:

1) Teachers perceived that girls have a higher self-concept than boys (Table and Figure 7);

2) girls perceived themselves as better students than did boys (Table and Figure 9);

3) parents of gifted students perceived their children as better students than did parents of nongifted children (Table and Figure 10);

4) teachers perceived gifted children as better students than nongifted children (Table and Figure 11);

5) teachers perceived girls as better students than boys (Table and Figure 11);

6) classmates perceived gifted children as better students than nongifted children (Table and Figure 12);
7) *classmates perceived* gifted girls as better students than the other three groups (Table and Figure 12).

Tables and figures 7, 9, 10, 11, and 12 reflect scores in which the F-Observed was higher than necessary to reach an .05 probability level. Self-concept, reflected self, others' perceptions of self-concepts (reflected self/teacher the one exception), and ideal self showed no significance across giftedness or gender. However, the student self mean scores and others' perceptions as student/parent, teacher, classmate, all contained significance levels.
Table 1
Summary of Analysis of Variance with Repeated Measures of Mean Differences for Self-Concept on the SPI

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Effect</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>Degrees of Freedom</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F--Ob.</th>
<th>Probability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gifted or n/g (A)</td>
<td>23.23</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>23.23</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex (B)</td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A x B</td>
<td>71.30</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>71.30</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within</td>
<td>6679.33</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>71.06</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*=P>=.05 significance
Figure 1.

Self-concept on the SPI: Means and Standard Deviations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gifted Girls</strong></td>
<td>9.11</td>
<td><strong>22.1</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N=30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gifted Boys</strong></td>
<td>8.82</td>
<td><strong>23.61</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N=23</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Non-gifted Girls</strong></td>
<td>7.58</td>
<td><strong>22.84</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N=25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Non-gifted Boys</strong></td>
<td>7.89</td>
<td><strong>20.9</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N=20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Standard Deviation**  
**Means**

Entire Sample SD=8.35  
Entire Sample Mean=22.40  
N=98
Table 2

Summary of Analysis of Variance with Repeated Measures of Mean Differences for Reflected Self--Parent on the SPI

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Effect</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>Degrees of Freedom</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F--Ob.</th>
<th>Probability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gifted or n/g (A)</td>
<td>3.41</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.41</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex (B)</td>
<td>91.28</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>91.28</td>
<td>.88</td>
<td>.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A x B</td>
<td>206.60</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>206.60</td>
<td>1.98</td>
<td>.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within</td>
<td>9683.05</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>104.12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*P >= .05 significance
Figure 2.

Reflected Self—Parents on the SPI: Means and Standard Deviations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Means</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gifted Girls</td>
<td>10.71</td>
<td>19.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N=30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gifted Boys</td>
<td>9.17</td>
<td>24.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N=22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-gifted Girls</td>
<td>9.93</td>
<td>21.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N=25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-gifted Boys</td>
<td>10.81</td>
<td>20.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N=20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Entire Sample SD=10.21
Entire Sample Mean=21.37
N=97
Table 3

Summary of Analysis of Variance with Repeated Measures of Mean Differences for Reflected Self—Teacher on the SPI

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Effect</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>Degrees of Freedom</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F—Ob.</th>
<th>Probability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gifted or n/g (A)</td>
<td>191.94</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>191.94</td>
<td>2.55</td>
<td>.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex (B)</td>
<td>5.83</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.83</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A x B</td>
<td>103.11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>103.11</td>
<td>1.37</td>
<td>.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within</td>
<td>6999.58</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>75.26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*=P>=.05 significance
Figure 3.

Reflected Self—Teacher on the SPI: Means and Standard Deviations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gifted Girls</td>
<td>9.77</td>
<td>24.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N=30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gifted Boys</td>
<td>8.09</td>
<td>27.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N=22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-gifted Girls</td>
<td>6.24</td>
<td>23.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N=25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-gifted Boys</td>
<td>10.06</td>
<td>22.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N=20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

Standard Deviation
Means

Entire Sample SD=8.70
Entire Sample Mean=24.51
N=97
Table 4

Summary of Analysis of Variance with Repeated Measures of Mean Differences for Reflected Self-Classmate on the SPI

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Effect</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>Degrees of Freedom</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F--Ob.</th>
<th>Probability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gifted or n/g (A)</td>
<td>267.91</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>267.91</td>
<td>2.68</td>
<td>.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex (B)</td>
<td>47.27</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>47.27</td>
<td>.47</td>
<td>.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A x B</td>
<td>89.40</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>89.40</td>
<td>.90</td>
<td>.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within</td>
<td>9280.14</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>99.79</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*=P>=.05 significance
Figure 4.

Reflected Self—Classmates on the SPI: Means and Standard Deviations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Gifted Girls</th>
<th>N=30</th>
<th>Gifted Boys</th>
<th>N=22</th>
<th>Non-gifted Girls</th>
<th>N=25</th>
<th>Non-gifted Boys</th>
<th>N=20</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>^9.87</td>
<td>**24.1</td>
<td>^8.52</td>
<td>**27.45</td>
<td>^7.43</td>
<td>**22.68</td>
<td>^13.78</td>
<td>**22.15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

```
2 4 6 7 8 10 12 14 16 18 20 22 24 26 28 30 32 34 36 38 40
```

^Standard Deviation
**Means

Entire Sample SD=10.03
Entire Sample Mean=24.09
N=97
Table 5

Summary of Analysis of Variance with Repeated Measures of Mean Differences for Ideal Self on the SPI

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Effect</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>Degrees of Freedom</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F—Ob.</th>
<th>Probability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gifted or n/g</td>
<td>58.51</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>58.51</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td>.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(A)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex</td>
<td>45.58</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>45.58</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td>.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(B)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A x B</td>
<td>4.88</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.88</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within</td>
<td>7469.09</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>79.46</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*=P>=.05 significance
Figure 5.

Ideal Self on the SPI: Means and Standard Deviations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gifted Girls</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>7.31</td>
<td>29.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gifted Boys</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>9.27</td>
<td>28.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-gifted Girls</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>4.80</td>
<td>31.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-gifted Boys</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>13.52</td>
<td>29.85</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Entire Sample SD=8.84
Entire Sample Mean=30
N=98
Table 6

Summary of Analysis of Variance with Repeated Measures of Mean Differences for Others' Perception—Parent on the SPI

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Effect</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>Degrees of Freedom</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F—Ob.</th>
<th>Probability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gifted or n/g (A)</td>
<td>1.44</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.44</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex (B)</td>
<td>14.97</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14.97</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A x B</td>
<td>288.48</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>288.48</td>
<td>2.98</td>
<td>.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within</td>
<td>8312.71</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>96.66</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*=P>=.05 significance
Figure 6.

Others' Perception—Parent on the SPI: Means and Standard Deviations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gifted</th>
<th>Girls</th>
<th>&quot;8.28</th>
<th>**23.2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N=30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gifted</td>
<td>Boys</td>
<td>&quot;13.17</td>
<td>**20.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N=19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-gifted</td>
<td>Girls</td>
<td>&quot;9.19</td>
<td>**19.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N=24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-gifted</td>
<td>Boys</td>
<td>&quot;8.88</td>
<td>**24.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N=17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

"Standard Deviation
**Means

Entire Sample SD=9.84
Entire Sample Mean=21.9
N=90
### Table 7

**Summary of Analysis of Variance with Repeated Measures of Mean Differences for Others' Perception—Teacher on the SPI**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Effect</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>Degrees of Freedom</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F—Ob.</th>
<th>Probability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gifted or n/g (A)</td>
<td>473.49</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>473.49</td>
<td>3.21</td>
<td>.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex (B)</td>
<td>1834.70</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1834.70</td>
<td>12.44</td>
<td>.00 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A x B</td>
<td>296.85</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>296.85</td>
<td>2.01</td>
<td>.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within</td>
<td>13569.67</td>
<td>92</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* *=P>=.05 significance
### Figure 7.

**Others' Perception—Teacher on the SPI: Means and Standard Deviation.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Group</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Means</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gifted Girls</td>
<td>N=29</td>
<td></td>
<td>11.29</td>
<td>29.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gifted Boys</td>
<td>N=22</td>
<td></td>
<td>13.57</td>
<td>24.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-gifted Girls</td>
<td>N=25</td>
<td></td>
<td>9.61</td>
<td>28.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-gifted Boys</td>
<td>N=20</td>
<td></td>
<td>14.36</td>
<td>16.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Standard Deviation**

**Means**

Entire Sample SD=12.99
Entire Sample Mean=25.19
N=96
Table 8

Summary of Analysis of Variance with Repeated Measures of Mean Differences for Others' Perception--Classmate on the SPI

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Effect</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>Degrees of Freedom</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F--Ob.</th>
<th>Probability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gifted or n/g</td>
<td>204.86</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>204.86</td>
<td>2.64</td>
<td>.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(A)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex</td>
<td>81.58</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>81.58</td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td>.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(B)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A x B</td>
<td>143.74</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>143.74</td>
<td>1.85</td>
<td>.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within</td>
<td>7051.63</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>77.49</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*=P*=.05 significance
Figure 8.

Others' Perception—Classmate on the SPI: Means and Standard Deviations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Means</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gifted Girls</strong></td>
<td>6.29 <strong>27.07</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N=30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gifted Boys</strong></td>
<td>8.93 <strong>27.68</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N=22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Non-gifted Girls</strong></td>
<td>8.11 <strong>26.58</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N=24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Non-gifted Boys</strong></td>
<td>12.29 <strong>22.21</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N=19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

^^Standard Deviation
**Means

Entire Sample SD=8.89
Entire Sample Mean=26.12
N=95
Table 9

Summary of Analysis of Variance with Repeated Measures of Mean Differences for Student Self on the SPI

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Effect</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>Degrees of Freedom</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F—Obs.</th>
<th>Probability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gifted or n/g</td>
<td>303.40</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>303.40</td>
<td>1.89</td>
<td>.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(A)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex (B)</td>
<td>613.86</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>613.86</td>
<td>3.83</td>
<td>.05 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A x B</td>
<td>247.14</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>247.14</td>
<td>1.54</td>
<td>.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within</td>
<td>15061.77</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>160.23</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*=P>=.05 significance
Figure 9.

Student Self on the SPI: Means and Standard Deviations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gifted Girls N=30</td>
<td>11.29</td>
<td>**26.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gifted Boys N=23</td>
<td>12.49</td>
<td>**24.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Gifted Girls N=25</td>
<td>10.74</td>
<td>**25.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Gifted Boys N=20</td>
<td>16.49</td>
<td>**17.45</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Entire Sample SD=12.89
Entire Sample Means=23.79
N=98
Table 10

Summary of Analysis of Variance with Repeated Measures of Mean Differences for Others' Perception as Student--Parent on the SPI

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Effect</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>Degrees of Freedom</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F-- Ob.</th>
<th>Probability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gifted or n/g</td>
<td>1337.04</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1337.04</td>
<td>5.85</td>
<td>.02 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(A)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex (B)</td>
<td>519.21</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>519.21</td>
<td>2.27</td>
<td>.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A x B</td>
<td>86.76</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>86.76</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td>.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within</td>
<td>19639.58</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>228.37</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* = P >= .05 significance
Figure 10.

Others' Perception as Student--Parent on the SPI: Means and Standard Deviations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean (SD)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gifted</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Girls</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>^9.87 (36.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boys</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>^18.31 (29.15)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Gifted</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Girls</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>^15.68 (26.17)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boys</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>^17.86 (23.25)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

^Standard Deviation
**Means

Entire Sample SD=15.67
Entire Sample Means=29.62
N=90
Table 11

Summary of Analysis of Variance with
Repeated Measures of Mean Differences for
Others’ Perception as Student—Teacher on the SPI

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Effect</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>Degrees of Freedom</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F--Ob.</th>
<th>Probability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gifted or n/g</td>
<td>3719.52</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3719.12</td>
<td>10.75</td>
<td>.00 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(A)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex</td>
<td>5346.07</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5346.07</td>
<td>15.45</td>
<td>.00 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(B)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A x B</td>
<td>53.58</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>53.58</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within</td>
<td>31036.93</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>346.05</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*=P>=.05 significance
Figure 11.

Others' Perception as Student--Teacher on the SPI: Means and Standard Deviations.

| Gifted Girls | ^10.54 | **38.53 |
| N=30          |       |        |
| Gifted Boys  | ^16.27 | **24.95|
| N=22          |       |        |
| Non-Gifted Girls | ^19.15 | **27.46|
| N=24          |       |        |
| Non-Gifted Boys | **10.85 | ^27.75 |
| N=20          |       |        |

**Standard Deviation

Entire Sample SD=20.81
Entire Sample Means=26.89
N=96
Table 12

Summary of Analysis of Variance with Repeated Measures of Mean Differences for Others' Perception as Student--Classmate on the SPI

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Effect</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>Degrees of Freedom</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F--Ob.</th>
<th>Probability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gifted or n/g</td>
<td>635.63</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>635.63</td>
<td>4.07</td>
<td>.04 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(A)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex</td>
<td>478.09</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>478.09</td>
<td>3.06</td>
<td>.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(B)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A x B</td>
<td>877.56</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>877.56</td>
<td>5.61</td>
<td>.02 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within</td>
<td>14378.50</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>156.29</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*=P>=.05 significance
Figure 12.

Others' Perception as Student—Classmate on the SPI: Means and Standard Deviations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Mean (SD)</th>
<th><strong>Mean (SD)</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gifted Girls</td>
<td>8.79 (31.17)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gifted Boys</td>
<td>10.84 (32.77)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Gifted Girls</td>
<td>11.21 (32.08)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Gifted Boys</td>
<td>19.22 (21.42)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Standard Deviation

Entire Sample SD = 13.02
Entire Sample Means = 29.84
N = 96
Table 13

Summary of SPI Variable Means and Two Way ANOVAS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Parent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gifted Girls</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>22.1</td>
<td>19.3</td>
<td>24.6</td>
<td>24.1</td>
<td>29.7</td>
<td>23.2</td>
<td>29.4</td>
<td>27.1</td>
<td>26.1</td>
<td>36.1</td>
<td>38.5</td>
<td>31.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gifted Boys</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>23.6</td>
<td>24.2</td>
<td>27.2</td>
<td>27.5</td>
<td>28.7</td>
<td>20.4</td>
<td>24.1</td>
<td>27.7</td>
<td>24.2</td>
<td>29.2</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>32.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Non-gifted Girls</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>22.8</td>
<td>21.8</td>
<td>23.8</td>
<td>22.7</td>
<td>31.7</td>
<td>19.8</td>
<td>28.5</td>
<td>26.6</td>
<td>25.7</td>
<td>26.2</td>
<td>27.5</td>
<td>32.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Non-gifted Boys</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20.9</td>
<td>20.9</td>
<td>22.3</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>29.9</td>
<td>24.3</td>
<td>16.1</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>17.5</td>
<td>23.3</td>
<td>10.9</td>
<td>21.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*P >= .05
Summary

Self-concept mean scores showed no significant differences between or among giftedness, nongiftedness, and gender; however, all categories of student self exhibited significance.

Gifted girls' mean scores contained significant levels more often than the other three groups (5 occurrences). Teachers perceived gifted girls as having a more positive self-concept; the girls believed themselves to be better students; and parents, teachers and classmates perceived the gifted girls to be better students than the other three groups.

Mean scores of nongifted girls contained the next highest number of significance levels (4 occurrences). Teachers perceived nongifted girls to have a more positive self-concept; nongifted girls perceived themselves as better students; and teachers as well as classmates perceived them as better students than boys.

Thirdly, gifted boys' mean scores showed significance in three categories--teachers, parents and classmates perceived them to be better students than nongifted peers.

Lastly, nongifted boys' mean scores showed no significance levels. No set of persons--parent.
teacher, or classmate--perceived them as having higher self-concepts or student self-evaluations than the other groups of students.
Chapter IV

Discussion and Conclusions

As noted earlier, the review of literature specific to giftedness supported a position that these children oftentimes are not utilizing their academic and/or intellectual potential. This same literature review suggested that self-concept might be one avenue to explore when attempting to reduce stress which, in turn, could allow maximization of potential for gifted students.

In an effort to ascertain if self-concepts of gifted children were significantly different than those of nongifted children, the writer administered 12 different forms of the Soares and Soares Self Perception Inventory (1985) to 98 students--53 gifted, 45 nongifted. In all, 1176 inventories were administered in the categories of: Self-concept; reflected self/parent, teacher, classmate; ideal self; others' perception/parent, teacher, classmate; student self; and others' perception as a student/parent, teacher, classmate. These were administered to determine if significant differences existed for gifted and/or nongifted, males and females.
One hypothesis with twelve parts was investigated:
As measured by the Soares and Soares Self Perception Inventory, there will be no significant difference between and among mean scores of gifted girls, gifted boys, nongifted girls, and nongifted boys when the variables are: Self-concept; reflected self/parent, teacher, classmate; ideal self; others' perception/parent, teacher, classmate; student self; others' perception as a student/parent, teacher, classmate.

Overall, the analysis of data noted significant differences in five of the 12 variables: Others' perceptions of the self/teacher; student self; and others' perceptions as student/parent, teacher, classmate. The 12 variables, significant or not, will be discussed in two sections--those pertaining to self variables and those to student variables. Implications for the four groups of children--gifted girls, gifted boys, nongifted girls and nongifted boys--as well as for giftedness or nongiftedness and gender, also will be discussed.

Self Concept, Reflected Self, Ideal Self, and Others' Perceptions of the Self

Of the eight variables in the "self" category--Self-concept; reflected self/parent, teacher, classmate; ideal self; and others' perceptions of the
self/parent, teacher, classmate—only one, others’ perceptions of the self/teacher, showed significance in the self-concept variables. Table 7 illustrates that teachers (five men and three women) perceived girls, gifted and nongifted, to possess more positive self-concepts. Possibly this is because the "fit," emotionally and socially, between girls and school is better than that between boys and school. Passivity and dependency (usually attributed to females) simply "works" better in elementary schools (Wells, 1985). In addition, girls receive better grades than boys throughout elementary school, high school, and college (Reis, 1987). These factors could lead teachers to perceive that girls hold more positive self-concepts than boys.

Further, Loeb and Jay (1987) have gone so far as to say that giftedness can best be understood in the context of gender:

For girls, classroom success appears to be congruent with a positive self-image. The traditional feminine ideal seems to involve being well-behaved, conscientious, and obedient. Academic success, as well as high scores on standardized mental tests, may ensue from the need for "achievement through conformance" associated with the traditional female personality profile, at least in the elementary grades. Thus, the achieving young female develops a positive sense of control over her life space . . .

It is quite a different picture for
The ideal male. He is aggressive, self-reliant, and individualistic, a pattern more often associated with "achievement via independence." While such an intellectual orientation may serve him well at a later stage of educational training, it is one ill-suited for the elementary grades. There is evidence that the predominance of female teachers at these levels contributes to the perception of early education as "feminized." Thus, academic success, and particularly when it results in being labeled "gifted," may foster feelings of self-doubt, weakness, and lack of control in the young boy.

The gender pattern appears to undergo a shift during adolescence. High schools may be more supportive of the masculine achievement style than elementary schools. The positive ties between early education and femininity may reverse themselves during adolescence when girls are confronted by conflicts between their identity as gifted students and their emerging identity as women. . . Age may be an interacting variable with gender differences among the gifted . . . (pp. 12-13).

Lundy (1983) suggests that girls may be more adept socially due to brain function and cites Restak's (1979) work. Restak believes that women differ from men in their approach to obtaining information about the world. His contention is that women are predisposed to favor a more "communicative mode" in their information gathering; women ask other people, take advantage of the experience of other people, and, in general, avoid the need to personally encounter all the objects, circumstances, and people in their life-space. Because of this left hemispheric approach, Restak argues, "girls tend to conform by relying more
on social cues. Since they are also better equipped in the auditory mode, they can pick up significant information from tones of voice and intensity of expression. Thus, interpersonal skills appear at an earlier age and form the basis for the communicative mode most women maintain throughout their lifetime."

Restak concludes that these differences in performance are the results in differences in brain organization between men and women. In general, he argues, verbal and spatial abilities in males tend to be differentiated into the two hemispheres, while, for women, the non-verbal and verbal skills are likely to be found on both sides of the brain. In his view, the hemispheres of the woman's brain may be less specialized (and hence more adaptable?) for these functions (pp. 198-200).

Meanwhile, other studies of self-concepts of gifted and nongifted children reported results that were inconsistent (Karnes & Wherry, 1981; Maddux, Scheibe and Bass, 1982; Altman, 1983). Still others suggested that gifted children had higher self-concepts (Coleman & Fults, 1983; Kelly & Colangelo, 1984) and others believed them to be lower (CLPW, 1972; Klein & Cantor, 1976). It should be noted that many of these studies utilized the Piers Harris, an instrument believed by some (Janos & Robison, 1985) to
underestimate scores of nongifted, middle class children.

Loeb and Jay (1987) have suggested that future studies should not rely solely on self reports but, instead should include teacher, parent and ideal self-concept ratings as well. In response to Loeb and Jay, this study included those ratings and added others, that is, reflected self and classmate ratings. However, this study showed no significant difference in self-concept for boys or girls, the gifted or nongifted. In fact, no difference in any of the other self variables—Reflected self, ideal self or others’ perceptions of self—were found, with the one exception noted above—teacher.

**Student Self, Others’ Perception as**

**Student/Parent, Teacher, Classmate**

Of the five significant variables from the initial 12 variables, only one—others’ perception of the self, teacher—showed significance in the self-concept variable. Of the remaining four, all concerned the student self. On the whole, then, the suggestion by Ross and Parker (1980) that gifted students have a higher academic than social self was supported, as was Bracken’s (1980) position that “academic successes are not necessarily generalized to other nonacademic areas” (p. 717).
Apparently gifted children's perception of themselves as students indeed is higher than that of nongifted students of themselves as students. In addition, significant others--parent, teacher, classmate--perceived the gifted as better students than the nongifted. As suggested by Bracken (1980), gifted differ from the nongifted in the one area that directly separates the two groups--learning. Areas less directly related to the academic areas--self-concept, ideal self, and reflected self--were less favorably exhibited by gifted children. That is, gifted children did not differ significantly from their nongifted age mates in those categories.

In the current study, a review of Table 13 notes that mean scores for gifted girls in all "student self" variables are at or above .05 significance levels. The girls themselves, their parents, their teachers, and their classmates observed that gifted girls were better students than were the other three groups in this investigation.

While all sets of persons/parent, teacher, classmate, self, perceived gifted girls as better students than the other groups studied, and while females do receive higher grades throughout elementary school, high school, and college; adult professional productivity by gifted females is lower (Reis, 1987).
and women are noticeably missing in listings of genius (Gemant, 1961).

Researchers in the field of giftedness offer various reasons for this disparity: sex-role stereotypes and conflicts, concealment of intelligence, lack of energy, and male dominance in the science and math fields. Wells (1985) has claimed that, by preschool, children not only know what sex they are, but also have established what is expected of them relative to behavior patterns, play preferences and psychological characteristics; stereotyping already is firmly in place. Girls are expected to embrace the role of wife, mother, and nurturer in lieu of the assertive behaviors and high career-seeking of boys and men. Garrison, Stronge and Smith (1986) found that while 98% of boys expected to have full-time careers, only 46% of girls had similar expectancies. Girls also appear to view careers as optional.

For gifted girls, a double bind exists. While giftedness carries with it an obligation to assertively develop that potential, a woman also is expected by society to be supportive and nurturing (Garrison, Stronge, & Smith, 1986; Wells, 1985). Wells (1985) further claims that the overwhelming influence of socialization is, in large part, responsible for loss of IQ by gifted girls who outscore boys in the
elementary grades on the Stanford Binet Intelligence Test. From grades 8 through 12, however, this trend is reversed: Boys' scores remain stable; girls' scores fluctuate. With adolescence, achieving girls lose social status as intellectual achievements increasingly are devalued for girls through high school (Austin and Draper, 1981). Outside expectations snowball, roles become awkward, and self sabotage begins (Reis, 1987).

Austin and Draper (1981) concluded that this sabotage often takes the form of "hiding intelligence from boys and peers." Girls who compete with boys for grades often face rejection or undesirability if the girls appear "too smart" (Reis, 1987). Unfortunately, female role models who claim both their femininity and intelligence are few in number (Garrison, Stronge, & Smith, 1986).

Continuing, Garrison, Stronge, and Smith explain that a real conflict exists relative to the time and energy spent on career and family. Women, they claim, are noticeably missing in equal percentages when compared with men relative to recognition of achievements. This, according to the researchers, is because women have less time and commitment for the roles of student and worker, undertaking, instead, more responsibility for homemaking and childraising tasks. Garrison, Stronge and Smith further suggest that, at age
23, women have higher incomes, higher job prestige and satisfaction than men; by age 29, these factors are reversed and favor men.

Nonetheless, some gifted females do try to combine family and a meaningful career. Oftentimes, this combination results in a "perfection complex." Reis (1987) contends that

Many bright young females believe that they must be perfect in everything they attempt to do. Accordingly, they invest considerable energy in trying to be the best athlete, the best dancer, the best scholar, the best friend, and the best daughter. Additionally, bright young girls also feel they must be slender, beautiful, and popular. The perfection complex causes them to set unreasonable goals for themselves and to constantly strive to achieve at ever higher levels (p. 86).

Further, Reis cites Staines, Tavris & Jayarante (1974) who speaks of the "Queen Bee Syndrome." This construct describes a woman who is able to succeed like a male in work related activities, while simultaneously maintaining her femininity and succeeding as a mother and a wife.

A redefining of those older role models (such as nurturance at the expense of developing one's own potential, perfectionism, and females as the major contributor to childrearing and home management) may be necessary because many highly productive women classified as high achievers exist by putting out
maximum energy at all times, trying to do everything and do it well. It is not enough that they attempt to be outstanding in their work; their perfection complex also causes them to strive for a Jane Fonda body, a house that could be on the cover of "Better Homes and Gardens", and for perfect children. They would appear to be driven to trying to do everything well, often with minimal help from their spouses, and yet they feel plagued by guilt resulting from the perception that they may not have given their husband, children, home, and career enough time, enough care or enough attention. Tied between relationship and responsibility, these gifted females have a difficult time putting their own needs first (Reis, 1987).

It has been this writer's experience that bright girls at the sixth-grade level "sell" their giftedness for boys' and peer approval. These girls often find that boys do not like females brighter than they. To be socially accepted, it may be beneficial for many gifted girls to lose interest in academics, to assume socially questionable behavior and, in general, to forfeit that balance among academics, social and home life which had been characteristic of them at an earlier time. Perhaps the overemphasis upon academics by parent, teacher, classmate, and self contributes to the girls' imbalance of other elements in their lives at this age.
When they rebel and try to claim other parts of their lives, such as the social aspect, parents and teachers tend to overreact, causing more harm by imposing unrealistic restrictions, none at all, or giving up entirely.

Insisting upon her rights as a social individual, the gifted girl might: Rebel to an even greater degree; apply passive resistance; subvert her intellectual superiority even more; or any combination or all of the preceding. That delicate balance and/or perfectionism is no longer evident. At eleven or twelve years of age, after years of receptivity and deference to the wishes of parent and teacher, and after general conformity to rules, gifted girls can be seen as stressing their right to be human beings again, to make mistakes, to learn from those mistakes and, in general, to enjoy life. They have played the role assigned to them by parent and teacher; now they want to explore and define their own roles.

Lastly, and in addition to sex-role stereotyping, concealment of intelligence, and lack of energy, gifted girls' later lack of reconciliation of talent and home role may be due, in part, to male dominance in the math and science fields (Reis, 1987). Wells (1985) stipulates that sex-role stereotyping is oftentimes the dominating influence on courses chosen by high school
females who may subjugate math and science interests for popularity. Reis (1987) argues that the low representation of girls in the math and science fields is due to social rather than endogenous variables. Dowling (1981) recalls that, as a young girl, she believed that real thinking (as in math and science) was for men--professors, fathers, priests.

According to the findings of the current study, then, gifted girls' mean scores showed more significance in the areas of "student self" than did the mean scores for any other group of students. Research surveyed also indicated that the expectations ensuing from significant others could lead to stress, conflict and resulting loss of academic and intellectual potential. Eccles (1985) may have stated it best with the statement that "both the individual and society may be suffering from the underdevelopment and under-use of the intellectual talents of women."

A further review of Table 13 notes ranking in total number of occurrences of significance in student self variables: Gifted girls (4); nongifted girls (3); gifted boys (3); nongifted boys (0); from highest to lowest, respectively.

Nongifted girls expect themselves to be better students than nongifted boys. Teachers and classmates of nongifted girls also perceived these girls to be
better students than nongifted boys. Parents were the only set of persons who did not perceive nongifted girls as better students. Perhaps parents of the nongifted girls accepted a more traditional view of femininity and, therefore, did not perceive their daughters as students, but, instead, as future wives and mothers. It would seem that to be female in our society is a role that carries with it many expectations from a variety of sources and relative to behavior and attitude, such as passivity, dependence, noncompetetiveness and nurturing (as noted earlier in the discussion of gifted girls). Had these nongifted girls accepted the roles intended of them by society, they possibly could have experienced less internal conflict than has been attributed to gifted girls, girls who might be resisting those very same societal expectancies.

By contrast, gifted boys in the current study were perceived as significantly better students by parent, teacher, and classmate, but not by themselves. Possibly it is because gifted boys have not internalized expectations of others, choosing, instead, to make their own decision concerning role interpretation (also see discussion of Loeb and Jay's findings pp. 80-81). In addition, gifted boys more often attributed their successes to their own efforts
than did gifted girls, who more often attributed accomplishments to external forces, such as being in the right place at the right time or simplicity of task.

One group of students' mean scores—those of nongifted boys—contained no levels of statistical significance. No set of persons/parent, teacher, classmate, or self, held significantly high perceptions of them. Perhaps other activities such as sports, peer interaction, and competitiveness were more important to them. Austin and Draper (1981) have noted that the relative status of star athlete was higher than that of outstanding student; or perhaps lack of significantly high perceptions is indicative of the "I don't know or care" syndrome of adolescence.

According to Jersild, Brook and Brook (1978), adolescence is a time of greater storm or stress than are most periods in life (the period in which most students of the current study were engaged). The conflicts of interpersonal power, sexual adequacy, autonomy of beliefs, peer acceptance and usefulness often are confronted meaningfully during adolescence for the first time. The adolescent is too old to be treated as a child, and too young to have the rights of an adult. In many respects, adolescents are choosing themselves—who they are, what they are, what they
might become, what and where they will venture (pp. 13-18, 562-574).

Overall, the results of this study were similar to those reported by authors of the SPI (Soares & Soares, 1985). that is, the child's self ratings have been congruous with those made by parents, less so with classmates, and least with teachers. Number of occurrences in significance levels from Table 13 for each set of persons is explicative. The self categories showed 2 significant levels, parent--2, teacher--4, and classmate--3. It is interesting to note that classmates, at this age level, were closer in number of levels of significance than were teachers.

**Implications for Future Study**

While the study under current consideration did include elements not generally utilized in self-concept research, that is, reflected self, student self, and classmate perceptions, several issues emerge which are important enough to include in future research. Had the data been categorized more specifically--perhaps as ego strength, adaptability, self-sufficiency, self confidence--it is possible that significant differences in self-concepts of males and females, gifted and nongifted, would have emerged.

Longitudinal studies could ascertain if self-concept and student self are related at various
age-levels and help to discover when children are most "at risk." If such studies determined that certain children were "at risk," research could be utilized to aid development of programs for these students. Such programs might include delineation of characteristics, attitudes, and behaviors of parents and teachers who contribute to the rearing and education of self-satisfied, achieving students.

The current study could be replicated to include additional in-depth information from parents, teachers, and classmates. In this way, positive and negative interaction between child and significant others could be gleaned and synopsized. These studies could be done with a larger number of subjects in hopes that results obtained would be more significant and/or specific.

Evaluation instruments and their administration could be more standardized so that results across studies could be more comparable and more readily synopsized.

If definitive results were obtained from research relative to gifted and nongifted females and males, the dissemination of knowledge gleaned from such studies could be accomplished in a creative manner, such as use VCRs and/or television productions, thus enabling more parents, teachers and students access to such information.
Questions Requiring Thought for Parents and Teachers of the Gifted

The review of literature specific to gifted children indicated many areas of concern specific to this population, such as perfectionism, imbalance in academic and social areas, and gender stereotyping. After contemplation of these concerns and analysis of the data in the current study, the writer has developed a set of questions intended for thought and response by parent and teacher.

1.) Is the child loved just because s(he) is yours, for no other reason? Is "I love you if, when or because" avoided?

2.) Is the child's giftedness separated from his being? Is the child accepted only when s(he) succeeds?

3.) Is the child encouraged to try something that is more challenging and to risk the possibility of failure? Is the child allowed to learn from his/her own mistakes, sometimes with demonstrated support and sometimes on his/her own?

4.) Is the child allowed to assume responsibility for the consequences of his/her own actions?

5.) Is the child allowed to make choices? When presented, are alternatives realistic and acceptable?

6.) Is the child aware of expectations--behavioral, academic and otherwise--that are places on him/her? Are these expectations realistic and nonperfectionistic?

7.) Is the child aware of the implications of giftedness--both positive and negative?
8.) Is the child expected to deal with boredom on his/her own? Is the responsibility for interest and industry assumed jointly between parent and child?

9.) Is the child allowed to manipulate others?

10.) Is the child oversensitive to the demands and expectations of significant others?

11.) Has the child been exposed to various role models and career possibilities?

12.) Have boys had male teachers?

13.) Is the child given limitations and real-life boundaries by parents and teachers?

14.) Is there balance in the child's life—so much time for work, play, school, home and friends?

15.) Is the child allowed to be "a kid" at times? Are there times when parents and teachers "hold the reins," let the child falter and simply be "a child"—not gifted, not normal, just himself or herself?

Answers to questions such as these might provide parent and teacher with useful feedback about their own rearing and educational practices.

Summary

The current study was undertaken to ascertain if self-concepts and other related concepts—ideal self; reflected self; others' perceptions; and student self—contained significant differences between and among giftedness and nongiftedness, male and female. If differences did exist, perhaps this information could have been utilized to assist teachers and parents in
providing means for gifted students to reach potentials.

While differences were found in only one self-concept category, others' perception/teacher: all student self areas contained significant differences: student self: others' perceptions/parent, teacher, classmate. A ranking in number of occurrences of significances in sets of students emerged: gifted girls (4, student self, others' perceptions/parent, teacher, classmate); nongifted girls (3, student self, others' perceptions/teacher, classmate); gifted boys (3, others' perceptions/parent, teacher, classmate); and nongifted boys (0, no areas of significance).

Overall then, gifted girls received higher perceptions from all sets of persons/self, parent, teacher, classmate. While these high perceptions might possibly result in praise and recognition in the academic arena, this lauding also carries with it expectations and ensuing link between being and accomplishment. Whitmore (1980) may have stated it best:

If the degree of commitment is such that one's whole value as a person is dependent upon the perceived quality of a product, how strong and stable a self-concept can one possess, especially when perfection is always just over the horizon? The inability to reach the unrealistic goal of perfection, and impatience with one's progress may be expressed as moodiness and a poor self-concept.
Gifted girls long have been caught in dual role expectations (Reis, 1987).

For gifted boys problems stemming from academic precocity seem to resolve themselves partially in high school and further in college and adult life (Loeb & Jay, 1987).

Nongifted girls do not face the dual role expectations of gifted girls. Nongifted boys at this age seem to have received high perceptions from no set of persons, and this phenomena perhaps leaves them free to seek their own pursuits.

All in all, the study added dimensions to data collection in the areas of self-concept and student self of gifted and nongifted, males and females. This study might be replicated with an addition of interviews with students and significant others.

As researchers, educators, and parents discover more about gifted children's personality, perhaps these children's potent potential for leadership and innovation will be more utilized for the betterment of mankind, as well as their own happiness and well-being.
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ACADEMICALLY TALENTED PROGRAM

INSTRUCTIONAL MODEL
Dear Parents,

I am doing a doctoral study on children, self-concept, and achievement.

Research suggests that students who feel better about themselves do better in school.

We would like to test Kit Carson students to see if this is so for our population. The data would be tabulated and used in a study. No names would be used.

Parents, teachers, and classmates will be asked to complete a questionnaire requiring 10 minutes time.

If we may include your child in this study, please sign and return the bottom of this letter to school.

If you have any questions, please call Ms. Brady at school, 799-7113 or home, 645-4487.

THANK YOU for your time.

Sincerely,

Sandra Brady, Dr. Carl

Child's Name ______________________________
Parent Signature __________________________
Core Teacher ______________________________
Appendix E

Procedure for administering the SPI:

1. First tell the group (or individual), "We are going to spend some time now in looking at ourselves in special ways. What will be handed out to you will measure how you feel about yourself."

2. Hand out the Self-concept form.

3. Have them fill out the information requested at the top of the test form and also on the answer sheet, if answer sheets are to be used.

4. Explain the example and point out to them that all the items are to be answered in the same way, with a check placed on one end of the line if they feel very strongly about one side or the other, or somewhere in the middle if they feel less strongly about either one of the end words.

5. Remind the respondents that they should answer according to how they feel and not how they think others want them to feel about themselves.

6. When everyone has finished, correct the forms and hand out another set, following the same instructions given above.

Scoring

1. All inventories are scored in the same way.

2. Each item is scored separately first for obtaining an index score on each form and for inter-form comparisons on each item:

   "very" positive position +2
   "more" positive +1
   "more" negative -1
   "very" negative -2

Appendix F

Validity of SPI

1. Content Validity of SPI--
   Student Forms with Coopersmith's Self-Esteem Inventory (SEI)

   a. Coefficients from Full-Scale SEI and SPI:

   \[
   \begin{array}{c}
   SC (.68) \\
   RSC (.49) \\
   RSt (.44) \\
   RS (.63) \\
   IC (.29)
   \end{array}
   \]

   b. Coefficients from Short-Form SEI and SPI:

   \[
   \begin{array}{c}
   SC (.57) \\
   RSC (.40) \\
   RSt (.36) \\
   RS (.51) \\
   IC (.24)
   \end{array}
   \]

   c. SEI Full-Scale and SPI Self Concept: \( r = .63 \)

2. SPI with Tennessee Self Concept Scale: \( r = .44 \)

3. Multi-Rater Matrix/Self Concept-- (Reliability Coefficients in parentheses)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RATER</th>
<th>Self</th>
<th>Peers</th>
<th>Teachers</th>
<th>Parents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Self</td>
<td>(.89)</td>
<td>(.82)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peers</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td>(.66)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td>.36</td>
<td>.41</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(.88)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. Multi-Rater Matrix/Self Concept and Student Self

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rater</th>
<th>Self</th>
<th>Peers</th>
<th>Teachers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Self SC</td>
<td>(.94)</td>
<td>(.82)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SS</td>
<td>.47</td>
<td>(.79)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peers SC</td>
<td>.59</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>(.82)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SS</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>.49 (.71)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers SC</td>
<td>.49</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>.35 (.36)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SS</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td>.36 (.40)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.72 (.82)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

   (Reliability coefficients in parentheses)
Appendix G

Letter sent to School district for permission to use Human Subjects in research data.

Dear____________________

My name is Sandra Brady. and I am working on my doctors degree. I work for Dr. Kay Carl at Kit Carson Sixth Grade Center.

My dissertation is on self concept, giftedness and expectations of others. I would like to utilize Kit Carson students as Subjects. I have parental permission. Please see attached.

I will administer inventories to students and ask parents, teachers and classmates to fill out forms.

No CCSD testing data will be used. No names will be used. only data scores.

From my advisor, Dr. Mark Beals, I understand that I need CCSD permission to use the data in addition to the parents. Please advise me.

Thank you in advance for your consideration.

I am......

Sincerely,

Sandra Brady
Doctoral Candidate UNLV
Abstract

The problem investigated in this study was the correlation, if any, between and among mean scores of various dimensions of self-concept and student self earned by 98 sixth grade public school students identified as gifted and nongifted. Findings suggested that dimensions of self-concept are not different in gifted and nongifted children, while dimensions of student self are different in gifted and nongifted children.