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CHAPTER I
INTRODUCTION

As our society changes, the need for persons who have the intelligence and abilities to meet the requirements of the ever-expanding world in which we live increases. It is with this need in mind that gifted children have become a major focal point of education today.

To ensure the educational opportunities for gifted students, schools have developed special classes to challenge these bright children and enhance their intellectual fluency. The push for academic excellence is great. In an attempt to heighten these gifted children's abilities, it has become evident that their self-concept is a vital factor in their ability to reach their potential (Lundy, 45:8).

While many experts have studied this topic, no unified conclusion has been established as to what extent gifted children's self-concepts are effected by the fact that they are intellectually superior. The numerous opinions on this subject are greatly varied. This study attempted to disclose an answer to this problem, through the comparison of the self-concepts of gifted children to the self-concepts of "average" children. In doing so, new informa-
tion was discovered about how giftedness effects the child-
dren's self-concept.

Teachers as well as parents must concern themselves
with gifted children's affective as well as cognitive
well-being. "The psychological needs of the gifted must
be more adequately understood and more satisfactorily
managed if the potentials inherent in the individuals
are to be fully realized." (Lundy, 95:5).

This chapter contains the statement of the problem,
the need for the study, general questions to be answered,
general procedures used, limitations, definition of terms
and summary.

The Problem Statement

The problem of this study was to determine the differ-
ence that may exist between the gifted children's self-con-
cept and the self-concept of the average child as measured
by the Piers-Harris Children's Self-Concept Scale
(Piers. . . 52)

Need for the Study

Although there have been numerous studies performed
on this topic, the results are inconclusive. There is
a great need to discover how the self-concept is effected
by a child's giftedness. Educators demand academic excel-
ience from the gifted child without knowing how their
self-concept is being influenced. It is known that, in
order for a person to reach his/her utmost potential,
his/her mental, emotional and physical needs must be met.
As a result of this study, educators may be better able to understand the gifted children's self-concepts by identifying the different factors that effect their self concepts, and therefore enact procedure designed to enhance more positive self-concepts.

General Questions to be Answered

This study addressed several questions. They were:

1. Is there a statistically significant difference between gifted children's total self-concept and average children's self-concept?

2. Is there a statistically significant difference between gifted children's self-perceived behavior and average children's self-perceived behavior?

3. Is there a statistically significant difference between gifted children's self-perceived intellectual and school status and average children's self-perceived intellectual and school status?

4. Is there a statistically significant difference between gifted children's physical appearance and attributes and average children's physical appearance and attributes?

5. Is there a statistically significant difference between gifted children's anxiety and average children's anxiety?

6. Is there a statistically significant difference between gifted children's self-perceived popularity and average children's self-perceived popularity?

7. Is there a statistically significant difference
between gifted children's happiness and satisfaction and average children's happiness and satisfaction?

**General Procedure**

The procedures for this study were designed to determine if there was a difference between the self-concept of gifted children and the self-concept of average children. Specifically, the following procedures were employed:

1. The author reviewed the literature pertaining to the relationship between giftedness and self-concept.

2. The author administered the Piers-Harris Self-Concept Scale to the children enrolled in the 1986 Carroll College Gifted Institute.

3. The author tabulated the gifted students' scores according to the scoring procedures stated in the Piers-Harris Children's Self-Concept Scale Manual.

4. The gifted students' scores were compared to the cluster scale norm's sample as recorded by Piers-Harris (Piers, 52:50) using the T-test.

**Definition of Terms**

Gifted children - refers to those students enrolled in the 1986 Carroll College Gifted Institute.

Average students - applies to 485 public school children sampled by Piers-Harris (Piers, 52:50).

**Summary**

The problem of this study was to determine if there was a difference between self-concepts of gifted children and average children's self-concepts. Although the litera-
ture reviewed indicated numerous studies were done on gifted students' self-concepts, no conclusive information was obtained.

Seven general questions were identified that dealt with the difference between the self-concepts of gifted children and average children's self-concepts.
CHAPTER II
REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

Introduction

In a society that is constantly looking toward the future, the gifted child has become the focal point of our interests. It is in these children that many people expect to find our scientists, doctors, lawyers and our nation's leaders.

There have been numerous studies on these exceptional children and they have discovered many distinguishing characteristics that these children share. They then went beyond this point and developed means to identify these children who are gifted.

Special programs have been designed to challenge the gifted child's cognitive skills and enhance their creativity. In most instances, the child is taken out of the regular classroom, for at least a part of the day, to participate in "gifted classes."

Educators have developed superior programs in relation to the child's cognitive domain. However, in the midst of the push for academic excellence, the affective domain of the gifted child may have been forgotten.

A positive self-concept is beneficial to most and
almost essential for the gifted person (Lundy, 45:88; Stuart, 65:39). How does all of the attention focused on the gifted child affect his/her self-concept? This question must be answered.

"The psychological needs of the gifted must be more adequately understood and more satisfactorily managed if the potentials inherent in the individuals are to be fully realized" (Lundy, 45:5).

**Giftedness Defined**

Defining giftedness is a timeless problem. Man has attempted to solve the questions of who are the gifted for centuries. Progress has been made toward answering these questions, but there are no universal definitions as to what constitutes giftedness (Carroll & Laming, 8:1).

There are many evident reasons for this confusion. Semantics are the primary source of this problem. Creativity, intelligence, aptitude, and ability are abstract words that are used to measure another abstract word - giftedness (Carroll & Laming, 8:1).

Schermann (1966) stated that it is not possible to define giftedness in terms of end products due to its multi-dimensional character (creativity, superior intellect, and many specific generalized abilities). The problem of defining and identifying the gifted child becomes very complex when the researcher is unable to list the many forms of giftedness. Schermann emphasized that speaking in terms of creative, intellectual, social, mechanical, and artistic skills does not tell the entire story. She summarized that being overawed by the complexity of giftedness can be likened to being overwhelmed by the richness and variety of human behavior (Carroll & Laming, 8:1).

Giftedness can be defined in four categories: the
objective definition, the descriptive definition, the
comparative definition, or a combination of two or three
of these types (Luecking & Sumption, 44:4-6).

Giftedness is often objectively defined by a reference
to a source made on an intelligence test or a measurement
instrument (Leucking & Sumption, 44:4-6). The descriptive
definition is much more inclusive. Achievement, extra-
ordinary curiosity, creative thinking, unusual ability
to understand abstractions, artistic ability and maturity
in both the physical and social context are emphasized
in descriptive definitions (Luecking & Sumption, 44:4-6).

Comparative definitions make direct comparisons.
A student may be so high in class rank or academic rating
that he/she is set apart from other students (Luecking
& Sumption, 44:4-6).

Many of the definitions today are a combination of
two or three of these types of definitions.

The Federal Definition of Giftedness written in the
Maryland Report to Congress in 1972 and then revised in
1978 was:

For the purpose of this part, the term "gifted
and talented children" means children and, when-
ever applicable, youth, who are identified at
the preschool, elementary, or secondary level
of possessing demonstrated or potential abilities
that give evidence of high performance capabili-
ties in areas such as intellectual, creative,
specific academic, or leadership ability, or
in the performing and individual arts, and who
by reason thereof, require services or activities
not ordinarily provided by the school. (Sec.,
902, The Gifted and Talented Children's Act,
1978) (Hallahan & Kauffman, 34:50).
Clark (1983) states: Giftedness is a biologically rooted concept, a label for a high level of intelligence that results from the advanced and accelerated integration of functions within the brain, including physical sensing, emotions, cognition, and intuition. Such advanced and accelerated function may be expressed through the abilities such as those involved in cognition, creativity, academic aptitude, leadership or the visual and performing arts. Therefore, with this definition of intelligence, gifted individuals are those who are performing at high levels of intelligence, because of such advanced or accelerated development. These individuals require services or activities not ordinarily provided by schools in order to develop their capability more fully (10:6).

For the purpose of this paper, giftedness shall be defined in accordance with the Montana definition, which states:

"Gifted and Talented Children" means children of outstanding abilities who are capable of high performance and require differentiated educational programs beyond those normally offered in public schools in order to realize their contribution to self and society. The children so identified include those with demonstrated achievement or potential ability in a variety of worthwhile human endeavors (Cassidy & Johnson, 9:18).

**Characteristics of the Gifted**

**Physical.** The intellectually gifted child's physical characteristics tend to differ from the typical child's development. These physical differences are discussed in two different sections: growth and development and physical abilities.

Studies of the gifted child's growth and development show that at birth he/she was slightly heavier than the average child. The gifted child is also born with fewer
major or minor birth defects than is the average child. The gifted child often cuts his/her first tooth two months before a non-gifted child. He/She may also walk or talk earlier than his/her average peer (Sawrey & Telford, 58: 219). This information is obtained through studies of older gifted students. These characteristics are not used to identify giftedness in infants or toddlers.

The gifted child is often healthier than his/her peers. "Terman and his collaborators show gifted boys and girls are, as groups, equal or superior to average boys and girls in health and physical energy to almost the same degree as in other traits (Force & Garrison, 24:154). Unfortunately, because of this abundant display of energy, gifted children are often incorrectly labeled as hyperactive" (67).

The gifted child is also more advanced in the neurological and sensory areas of physical development.

It is now possible to speak of the gifted as having at least three areas of advanced or increased brain growth: the growth of dendritic spines, increase in the complexity of networks of synaptic connections among neurons and the division of neurological cells (Clark, 10:6).

All of these factors contribute to a more effective and efficient brain function (Clark, 10:6). This may have a positive effect on the sensory areas as well. The gifted child has an elevated sensory awareness in which he/she gains information from his/her environment. Some experts believe that a gifted child may develop a sixth sense
in which he/she is able to communicate telepathically; however, this has not been proven (67).

The superiority of the gifted child in the physical domain is somewhat controversial. Some experts believe that gifted children are, as a whole, superior physically as well as mentally. However, others state that gifted children are somewhat inferior in his/her physical abilities. Both parties agree that if in fact, the gifted child is not superior physically, the child may refuse to participate in those activities in which he/she is not superior. Consequently, this may result in avoidance of physical activity all together or a neglect of physical well being (Clark, 10:96). Which may result in the belief that gifted children are physically inferior.

**Affective.** Gifted children experience the same excitement and disappointments that all other children do. However, there are some characteristics in the affective domain that are seen repeatedly in gifted children.

In the works of Terman and his collaborators, sufficient experimental evidence was presented to indicate that intellectual precocity is not in any manner an indication by itself of an antisocial or negative personality (Force & Garrison, 24:161).

This type of child usually gets along well with peers, however, he/she sometimes dominates others in an activity. The gifted child is self-confident with other children of his/her age, as well as with adults (Gallagher & Kirk, 30:92). The gifted child may become easily frustrated
with others as well as with himself/herself, because of the high standards he/she has set. When these standards are not met, in the time period he/she has set, the gifted child may become upset or angry. The gifted child has a sharp sense of humor. However, he/she may use this humor to be hurtful to others (Clark, 10:94-95).

The gifted child is also very emotional. He/She is quite aware of the non-verbal cues of others and is often able to make inferences from those cues. The gifted child is often advanced in his/her self-awareness. Unfortunately, this may result in the child feeling different from his peers (67). He/She is usually self-directed and self-motivated. "As a group, bright children are less inclined to have nervous disorders and to be poorly adjusted emotionally, than average children" (Force & Garrison, 24:164).

The gifted child has a strong sense of morality. He/She, in his/her social behavior and attitudes, may demonstrate the consistency in his/her internal value system. She/He may also modify her/his value system based on new knowledge (Becker & Tuttle, 4). The gifted child expects other people's actions and stated values to coincide with his/her value system (67). Because of this high moral or value stability, the gifted child is often more honest than lower intelligence children (Force & Garrison, 24:168-9).

Creativity. Creativity is closely associated with
mental giftedness. Although creativity is not solely a characteristic of gifted children, it is often another facet of their character.

In a pamphlet produced by the Council of Exceptional Children, four types of creative characteristics of the gifted child are described.

- They are fluent thinkers, able to produce a large quantity of possibilities, consequences or related ideas.

- They are flexible thinkers, able to use many different alternatives and approaches to problem solving.

- They are original thinkers, seeking new, unusual or unconventional associations and combinations among items of information. They also have an ability to see relationships among seemingly unrelated objects, ideas or facts.

- They are elaborative thinkers, producing new steps, ideas, responses or other embellishments to a basic idea, situation, or problem (67).

Other studies show that the gifted child generates many ideas. He/She will then play with these ideas and may go beyond the usual or known (Becker & Tuttle, 4:36). They may display imagination, intellectual playfulness and fantasy (67).

These children may constantly ask questions and show curiosity about objects, ideas, situations or events. They are willing to work on complex problems and seem to thrive on problem situations. Gifted children are less intellectually inhibited than their peers; therefore, they may express opinions and ideas more freely (Becker & Tuttle, 4:36).
The gifted child is a good guesser. He/She may construct a hypothesis or a "what if" question easily (Becker & Tuttle, 4:36). This is probably a reason why the gifted child enjoys science.

The fine arts, music and dance are usually enjoyed by the gifted child. These children may often be dramatic in their expressions (Clark, 10:35). "They have a sensitivity to beauty and are attracted to aesthetic dimensions" (67).

Cognitive. High cognitive levels define an intellectually gifted student. These levels are most often measured through their scholastic abilities, learning characteristics, and measures of intelligence.

"The clearest difference between gifted children and average children is in their reading and other scholastic pursuits" (Force & Garrison, 24:156). The gifted child usually learns to read at an earlier age with a better understanding of the language (67). "A study of the early reading of these students revealed that forty-seven percent of the girls and thirty-three percent of the boys had learned to read before entering school" (Force & Garrison, 24:156). They use reading as a means of gathering information. The child may read and study about a topic only for the sake of knowing the information; the gifted child enjoys reading for entertainment purposes as well.

The gifted child is also superior in oral and written
communication. He/She is better able to articulate their thoughts and feelings with rich expression. The gifted child often has an unusually advanced vocabulary for his/her age and grade level. He/She is then able to use these terms in a meaningful way (Gallagher & Kirk, 30:92).

The gifted child enjoys intellectual activities. His/Her thought process are more flexible and function at an accelerated pace. This type of child has an unusual capacity for processing information. He/She also has superior information retention abilities. The gifted child stores this information and then is able to quickly recall it when needed (Clark, 10:91-3).

The gifted child is a good observer. He/She can pick out important details when seen. The gifted child has a heightened capacity for seeing unusual and diverse relationships (Clark, 10:91-3). He/She can see the underlying principles and can make valid generalizations concerning these principles.

These children have a rapid insight into cause-effect relationships (67). The gifted child is often skeptical and critical, making him/her quick to spot inconsistencies (67).

The gifted child is quite self-motivated. This type of child usually strives for perfection. He/She is self-critical and not easily satisfied. Goals are set by the gifted child and he/she works until the goals are met. Concentration and attention are often maintained for longer
periods of time by the gifted child. However, if the subject is not interesting or challenging enough for this child, this may not hold true. The gifted child is usually more able to work independently at an earlier age than other children (67). This often continues through the school years.

In the classroom, the gifted child usually responds to questions asked more quickly and appropriately than his/her non-gifted peers. He/She usually asks questions that are relative to the topic or subject being discussed. He/She may appropriately explain the reasons for making a decision (Becker & Tuttle, 4:36).

The I.Q. score of each gifted child will vary. There seems to be no exact cut off score that separates the gifted child from the average child. Children who score above a certain point, an I.Q. score of 130 or 140 or whatever is agreed upon, are called gifted.

In Terman's notable investigations, the I.Q., as measured by the Stanford-Binet Intelligence Test (Terman and others, 1925) was the criterion used. The minimum score originally set for the gifted was 140, although some children scoring as low as 135 were later included in this group. Subsequently, other investigators have employed other scores as being the minimum for the gifted child. Perhaps the most popular figure has been an I.Q. of 130 but I.Q.'s lower than 130 have been used to select children for special classes. A.O. Heck (1953) indicated that an I.Q. of 125 was an approximate for determining admission to classes for the intellectually superior, and children with I.Q.'s of 120, whose performance is consistently outstanding in areas of value to society, have been considered eligible for special classes (Otto, 1957) (Sawrey & Telford, 58:209).
An I.Q. test used to determine giftedness is the Slosson Intelligence Test. This test identifies a very superior person as one who has an I.Q. of 140 and above. A superior person has an I.Q. between 120 and 139 and a bright person has an I.Q. of 110 to 119 (Slosson, 61:front cover).

While there is no set I.Q. score, it is easy to see that a high I.Q. is yet another characteristic of the intellectually gifted child.

Identification

Identification of the gifted child is essential, "Before we can place gifted children in special educational programs, we have to find them. And that is not an easy task." (Gallagher & Kirk, 30:89). "The first step in identifying gifted students is determining the reason for finding them. Specific program needs and requirements, then, shape the identification." (Gallagher & Kirk, 30:90). Identification processes are discussed in three categories: Nomination, Pupil Products and Tests.

Nominations. Nominations may be given by teachers, parents, peers, and others. "Perhaps the most prevalent method of identifying gifted individuals is to ask for teacher recommendations" (Becker & Tuttle, 4:54). Even though teacher nomination is the most widely used means of identification, it is limited in its usefulness (Martinson, 47:17). Teachers are often attracted to children who are neat, punctual, answer correctly and cooperate.
However, these are not necessarily traits of gifted individuals (Becker & Tuttle, 4:54). "Student behavior also affects teacher nominations. Teachers prefer well-behaved students, particularly those who never ask impertinent or unusual questions for which the teacher has no answer" (Davidson & others, 18:8). This type of child is more likely to be nominated into a gifted program by a teacher, even though he/she may not be gifted (Davidson & others, 18:8). "The failure of teachers to identify gifted individuals accurately may reflect their inability to recognize behaviors indicative of giftedness" (Becker & Tuttle, 4:54).

In combination with other means, teacher nomination is a good identification method. However, the use of teacher judgment is the least effective identification method that may be used (Martinson, 97:17). With proper guidelines and inservice workshop on behaviors and characteristics of the gifted, the teacher may become more accurate (Becker & Tuttle, 4:54).

A gifted child often displays his/her true abilities in an environment that is relaxed and where he/she does not feel pressure to conform. One of the most informal situations is in the child's home. Consequently, parents may observe certain characteristics of giftedness that are not displayed in the classroom environment (Becker & Tuttle, 4:59). Parents may bring in special work the child has done at home. The parents may mention certain
cues of giftedness in informal conversation. "Such cues should be used as a basis for referral and should not be discounted. It is easy to dismiss products or information as parental pride, but parents have much more contact with their child than the teacher has" (Martinson, 47:46). Special questionnaires may also be sent out to parents in order for them to give special information that may not be noticed or known by the teacher (Martinson, 47:47). Unfortunately, problems may arise in parent recommendation because not all children who are recommended will be selected for gifted programs (Becker & Tuttle, 4:56). "One way to secure the necessary information without indicating admission to a program, is to gather it as part of the routine for all instruction. This can be as a checklist of activities or as a multiple choice biography inventory" (Becker & Tuttle, 4:56).

"Although not given enough importance by many, student evaluations can provide valuable insights into the abilities of their peers" (Becker & Tuttle, 4:56). Children are often more aware of a peers' intelligence and/or creativity than are his/her teachers and parents (Davidson & others, 18:8). Peer nomination can be accomplished by listening to comments children make about one another. They may also identify children they would like to have help them on various academic or creative tasks (Martinson, 47:46). One drawback of this type of nomination is that it is often very dependent on popularity because social acceptance
and self-confidence are other components which may affect a child's perception of his/her peers (Davidson & others, 18:8).

Any other person who knows of a child's capabilities should be given the opportunity to nominate a potentially gifted student. Community members, former teachers and other school resource personnel may be able to identify some superior characteristics that are not demonstrated at home or in the classroom (Martinson, 47:45).

Pupil Products. Pupil products are another means that may be used to identify a gifted child. Some of the work that may be evaluated include biographical and interest inventories, autobiographies, outstanding accomplishments, and generations of creativity.

Biographical and interest inventories may be unrecogn- nized as having gifted traits. Multiple choice items, open ended questions, checklists, or any combination of these may be used in an interest or biographical inventory. A "score" can be obtained by evaluating the inventory on the basis of appropriate responses to questions concerning interests relevant to the invention program as well as behaviors (Becker & Tuttle, 4:55).

The autobiography is more useful with elementary age school children than with secondary students who often refuse such an assignment as an invasion of privacy (Martinson, 47:50). Younger children enjoy talking about themselves and are not intimated by talking into a tape recorder (Martinson, 47:50).
Recognition of outstanding accomplishments includes the recognition of students possessing special talents in the area of music, art, and leadership. Also, the utilization of class grades may be used to indicate some gifted individuals (Haring, 35:196).

There are problems that occur when using class grades or transcripts as a basis of identification. There is no way to elaborate on the grade that was given without teacher input. "Grades often reflect perception of appropriate classroom behavior rather than actual ability" (Becker & Tuttle, 4:54).

Many times a child's work is judged by creativity experts. Schools rely on experts in various fields to judge the pupil's work because of the special nature of many creative talents (Martinson, 47:55).

"As Barron (1968) has pointed out, evaluation of creativity should be made by people who can distinguish eccentricity from originality and who understand the qualities of complexity and originality inherent in the creative act" (Martinson, 47:46). "When evaluating these creative products, developers should be sure that the evaluator has both expertise in the specific area of creativity and familiarity with the culture which the individual represents" (Becker & Tuttle, 4:52). An audition setting is often the area in which experts judge the visual and performing arts (Gallagher & Kirk, 30:91).

Tests. Evaluation instruments used to identify gifted individuals are produced in many forms, including Group
Intelligence and Achievement Tests, Individual Intelligence Tests, and Creativity Tests.

"Many systems use standardized group tests of intelligence and achievement to select students for a gifted program because of their seeming objectivity and ease of administration" (Becker & Tuttle, 4:49). These tests are useful in screening potentially gifted pupils, especially if used together (Martinson, 47:69). They are a practical means of screening large numbers of students, since individual tests are so costly. For those children who are near the cutoff point and for those children in which group tests are not representative of their abilities, individualized examinations can be given (Gallagher & Kirk, 4:97).

Unfortunately, group tests do have limitations. They are designed for the average student, making it hard to distinguish between the bright and the gifted student. The group test accomplishes its "objectivity" by confining responses to selection of correct answers chosen from various alternatives. Gifted children look beyond obvious answers (Becker & Tuttle, 4:50). These tests are unfair to those children who have not mastered standard English or who have trouble reading. Since group tests are often timed, they are sometimes difficult for those children who do not work well in timed test situations (Becker & Tuttle, 4:5; Gallagher & Kirk, 4:50). "The ceiling problem also occurs in group intelligence tests. Because
of the limited number of advanced items, pupils must have nearly total success to be designated gifted" (Martinson, 47:40).

To summarize, group tests are useful and relatively inexpensive. Used in combination with other methods, they are effective screening devices. It should be kept in mind that they fail to identify some gifted students and that they sometimes identify erroneously. Different language backgrounds, reading deficiencies, group test pressures, student motivation, and general learning deprivation should all be taken into account when the performance of individuals is evaluated" (Martinson, 47:44).

"Individually administered intelligence tests are probably the best indicators of giftedness we know today" (Haring, 35:196). Whenever possible, it is best to use individual tests to identify gifted. They provide a much more accurate ceiling than do group tests. Quality and style of the response can be examined as well as the correctness (Martinson, 47:58).

The examiner makes the student feel more comfortable and less threatened in the individualized testing situation (Becker & Tuttle, 4:52). The examiner may interview the child because the (interviewing) situation is already there (Martinson, 47:58). The problems of individualized tests include cost, lack of trained personnel to give the tests, in certain areas, and language and environmental handicaps are not always overcome (Martinson, 47:56-57). This test, like others, attempts to quantify, through paper and pencil, the potential quality of the student's abilities (Becker & Tuttle, 4:52).

"Although they focus on general intellectual ability,
only one of several areas of giftedness, individual I.Q. tests. . .are usually the final screening instrument in most schools" (Becker & Tuttle, 4:52).

Creativity tests are used to identify skills such as fluency, flexibility, originality, and elaboration through completion exercise and open ended questions (Becker & Tuttle, 4:52). "The interest of creativity has been due largely to a growing desire for measures of added human abilities and talents" (Martinson, 47:53).

There are many other means to identify gifted children, including Behavior Rating Scales (Becker & Tuttle, 4:53), Multiple Screening Measures (Martinson, 47:52), Abbreviated Tests (Martinson, 46:51), Cultural Fair Tests (Becker & Tuttle, 4:51), and Student Expression of Values and Ideals (Martinson, 47:50).

Self-Concept

Self-concept and self-esteem are often used synonymously. However, there is a difference between the two terms. "Self-concept is one's sense of oneself as a separate individual who possesses a unique set of characteristics" (Shaffer, 59:469). It differentiates a person's "self" from others and the environment (Ausubel, 1:273). "Self-esteem is a person's feelings about the qualities and characteristics that make up his or her self-concept" (Shaffer, 59:473). It is the value a person attaches to his self-description (Fung, Janos & Robinson, 27:78). Both of these terms are concerned with individualism.
Self-esteem goes beyond the unique characteristics, to the unique feelings one has about himself or herself. Self-esteem is an extension of self-concept. It may be for this reason that many authors use these two terms interchangeably.

For the purpose of this paper self-concept and self-esteem will be viewed as the same term. Both words will be used in relation to how a person feels about himself or herself.

**Relationship Between Giftedness and Self-Concept**

While there is no conclusive evidence as to whether the self-concept of the gifted child is positive or negative, it is evident that home environment, achievement, socialization, and class segregation have an effect on the self-concept.

**Environment.** A child's self-concept will be affected by his/her home environment. Positive parental treatment of the gifted child is often related to the child's high self-concept. Sibling relations also affect the gifted child's self-concept. A more able sibling's self-esteem is enhanced by competition with a lesser able child. A more able sibling may seek out instances of competition or comparison where he/she knows he/she will come out ahead. In these instances the self-esteem of the gifted child will increased (Grenier, 32:164-166). "The overwhelming characteristic of a highly gifted individual who has grown up with little or no recognition of his potential,
is the extremely low self-image he/she holds of himself/herself" (Stuart, 63:45).

Ross and Parker (1980) looked for a discrepancy between gifted students' academic and social self-concepts. They found that their gifted eighth graders had significantly higher academic than social self-concepts. They suggest two hypotheses to explain this discrepancy: (a) that this sort of child focuses most of his/her attention on academic areas, and (b) that gifted students may tend to be less comfortable with their peers (57:175).

Achievement. Academic achievement and overall success affect the self-concept. "...In the student, at the extreme limits of academic achievement (both top and bottom), the relationship between academic self-concept and achievement is high" (Colangelo & Pfleger, 13:11). "It is likely that self-esteem both enhances and is enhanced by success in various areas" (Fung, Janos & Robinson, 27:78).

Gifted children may have lower self-concepts because of the high expectations they have of themselves (Clark, 10:108). When goals are set, by themselves or by others, that are too high, they begin to display characteristics of underachievement (Franks, 25:175).

While there may be several mitigating factors associated with the inception of the underachieving pattern, low self-esteem seems to be experienced by most of these children. This in turn affects the child's willingness to risk and supports withdrawal from academic challenges (Fine & Pitts, 22:52).

Socialization. Self-concept is undeniably affected by peer relations and socialization. "Peer relations
are an important variable and probably play a central role in the development of self-concept" (Maddux, Scheiber & Bass, 45:77). Often times a gifted child views himself/herself as different from his/her peers, which causes difficulties in his/her relationship with others. These difficulties result in a diminished self-concept. A child who sees himself/herself as different may feel that being smarter made it harder to make friends. Peers who label gifted students with such stereotypes as egghead, bookworm and nerd are also destructive to the gifted child's self-concept (Fung, Janos & Robinson, 27:78-79).

A gifted child must find a way to be both productive and socially acceptable. He/She must acquire the skills to do this or he/she may repress his/her abilities in order to have social acceptance. This repression may lead the gifted child to become overly conforming, obedient and dependent, with damaging consequences to his self-concept (Khatena, 40:147).

"While social comparison are always an influence on self-concept, with age, increasing cognitive skills force children to adjust self-concept in reaction to more abstract social information about themselves" (Coleman & Fults, 14:47).

Class Segregation. Placement of a gifted child into special classes has an unknown effect on the self-concept. Some specialists argue that it has positive effects while others argue that it is negative.
Placing a gifted child into a special classroom changes his/her environment. "While self-concept is most affected by the abilities of the individuals...children judge their capabilities in relation to others in their immediate environment" (Coleman & Fults, 14:46). Since children use others whom they feel are similar to themselves for a comparison group, changes in that comparison group may alter the child's view of himself/herself.

"Gifted children, who are recognized for their ability through placement in academically talented programs, show superior feelings of competence and success as reflected by higher self-concept scores" (O'Such, Havertape & Pierce, 49:21).

When self-concept scores were analyzed across groups for each grade level, it was found that fifth and sixth grade gifted children fare no worse in terms of self-concept scores than gifted children who have not been identified and placed (Maddux, Scheiber & Bass, 46:80).

"Though some authorities assert that identification of gifted children and placement in programs have few negative effects on social status, there is some opinion and research to the contrary" (Maddux, Scheiber & Bass, 46:78).

Stopper (1978) found lower self-concept scores among gifted students in a self-contained program than among mainstreamed gifted children or non-gifted controls (62:77). Rogers (1979) compared scores on a self-concept test of gifted children placed in a program versus gifted children
not placed in a program. She found that self-concepts in the program actually declined after placement (55). Gallagher (1965) also discovered that the self-concepts of gifted children who attended a segregated school were lower than those who attended public high schools. The results of the study done by Wei-fan (1981) indicated that gifted students in special classes had much lower self-concepts than gifted students in regular classrooms. Wei-fan also found that gifted students in special classes felt less satisfied with themselves and had a large discrepancy between their perceived self and their ideal self (42:8).

When a gifted student is placed in a class with only gifted children, he/she uses others as a source for relevant social comparison. In this class of gifted children, a child may find himself/herself as a typical child rather than one who is a step above others. Therefore, his/her self-concept may decline (Coleman & Fults, 14:44). A child who is lower on the gifted scale may feel like he/she is among the most capable in a regular classroom. However, in a classroom with all gifted students, he/she may be one of the least able, causing a feeling of inadequacy. Thus, the self-concept of the child may again decline (Coleman & Fults, 14:44).

It seems likely that as gifted children begin to understand themselves as individuals possessing capabilities highly predictive of future social success, awareness of their enviable social position may serve to enhance self-concept and
become a bigger factor in identity management than social comparisons of comparable ability (Coleman & Fults, 19:47).

Summary

Educators have made many discoveries about the gifted child. They are now aware of their characteristics and have developed a way to distinguish the gifted from the non-gifted child. Programs have been developed to enhance the gifted child's many talents.

However, while the cognitive needs of the gifted child are being met, the psychological needs may be overlooked. Even though there have been numerous studies of the self-concept of the gifted child, the results are still contradictory.

There seems to be a need for an indepth study directed toward pinpointing the psychological needs of the gifted child. In addition, researchers need to examine more closely how labeling the child as gifted affects his/her self-concept.
CHAPTER III
PROCEDURES

Introduction

This study was designed to determine if there was a difference between self-concepts of gifted children and self-concepts of average children. Information was gathered from sixty-five students who participated in the 1986 Carroll College Gifted Institute. Each student was administered the Piers-Harris Self-Concept Scale entitled, "The Way I Feel About Myself." The test results were tabulated and the results were compared, using the t-test, to the cluster scales of the normative sample as recorded by Piers-Harris (Piers, 52:50).

Population

The population of this study was composed of sixty-five students who attended the Carroll College Gifted Institute, July, 1986. The sample was comprised of thirty-six girls and twenty-nine boys, who ranged in age from nine to fourteen years and were about to enter fifth through ninth grade. Table I shows the population distribution.
TABLE I
DISTRIBUTION OF GIFTED POPULATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Chronological Age</th>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>Grade Placement for Academic School Year 1986-1987</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

F = Female
M = Male
Collection of Data

Four adult assistants were trained in the proper administration procedure, according to the Piers-Harris Administration Manual, for the Piers-Harris Self-Concept Scale, on July 6, 1986.

The author and the trained assistants administered the Piers-Harris Self-Concept Scale to sixty-four students who attended the Carroll College Gifted Institute on July 7, 1986, in Helena, Montana.

Null Hypotheses

To determine the difference between the gifted child's self-concept and the self-concept of the average child, seven null hypotheses were tested. They were:

1. There is no statistically significant difference between gifted children's total self-concept and average children's total self-concept.

2. There is no statistically significant difference between gifted children's self-perceived behavior and average children's self-perceived behavior.

3. There is no statistically significant difference between gifted children's self-perceived intellectual and school status and average children's self-perceived intellectual and school status.

4. There is no statistically significant difference between gifted children's self-perceived physical appearance and attributes and average children's self-perceived physical appearance and attributes.
5. There is no statistically significant difference between gifted children's anxiety and average children's anxiety.

6. There is no statistically significant difference between gifted children's self-perceived popularity and average children's self-perceived popularity.

7. There is no statistically significant difference between gifted children's happiness and satisfaction and average children's happiness and satisfaction.

**Testing Instrument**

The Piers-Harris Children's Self-Concept Scale was administered in this study, to test the seven null hypotheses. The test was divided into seven sections including total self-concept, behavior, intellectual and school status, physical appearance and attributes, anxiety, popularity, and happiness and satisfaction.

Estimates of the content, criterion-related, and construct validity of the Piers-Harris have been obtained from a number of empirical studies. These studies have used a variety of approaches, including item analysis, intercorrelations among the scales and items, and comparisons of the responses of various criterion groups. The Piers-Harris has been compared to other scales designed to measure similar constructs (Piers, 52:57). The Piers-Harris scores were compared to the scores on the Lipsitt's Children's Self-Concept Scale (1958) for a sample of 98 special education students, twelve to sixteen years of
age, resulting in a correlation of .68 between the total scores for both scales (Piers, 52:59).

Reliability of the Piers-Harris Self-Concept Scale was established by the test-retest method.

A number of studies have investigated the test-retest stability of the Piers-Harris with both normal and special samples. The reliability coefficients ranged from .42 (with an interval of 8 months) to .96 (with an interval of 3 to 4 weeks). The median test-retest reliability was .73 (Piers, 52:53).

Summary

The population of this study was composed of all children attending the Carroll College Institute in July, 1986. Each child in this study was administered the Piers-Harris Children's Self-Concept Scale. The data was compiled in accordance with the Piers-Harris Manual.

Seven null hypotheses were identified. Each hypothesis was related to the difference between gifted children's self-concept and average children's self-concept. Content, criterion-related and construct validity of the Piers-Harris has been established through numerous studies. Reliability was established by the test-retest methodology in which the median was .73.
Overall Design

The sample for this study was comprised of sixty-five children who attended the Carroll College Gifted Institute in July, 1986. Each student was given the Piers-Harris Children's Self-Concept Scale entitled, "The Way I Feel About Myself." Upon completion, the scores were compiled in accordance with the Piers-Harris Children's Self-Concept Revised Manual 1984 (Piers, 52). This information was obtained to determine the difference, if any, between gifted children's self-concepts and average children's self-concepts.

Null Hypotheses

To determine the differences between self-concept of gifted and average children, seven null hypotheses were tested. They were:

1. There is no statistically significant difference between gifted children's total self-concept and average children's total self-concept.

2. There is no statistically significant difference between gifted children's self-perceived behavior and average children's self-perceived behavior.

3. There is no statistically significant difference between gifted children's self-perceived intellectual and school status and average children's self-perceived intellectual and school status.
4. There is no statistically significant difference between gifted children's self-perceived physical appearance and attributes and average children's self-perceived physical appearance and attributes.

5. There is no statistically significant difference between gifted children's anxiety and average children's anxiety.

6. There is no statistically significant difference between gifted children's self-perceived popularity and average children's self-perceived popularity.

7. There is no statistically significant difference between gifted children's happiness and satisfaction and average children's happiness and satisfaction.

Analysis and Results

Hypothesis 1

The null hypothesis that there is no statistically significant difference between gifted children's total self-concept and average children's total self-concept was rejected at the 0.004 level of significance. Table II reveals the total self-concept mean of the gifted population was 61.59 in comparison to the average population which was 56.04. It was concluded that a significant difference existed between gifted children's total self-concept and average children's total self-concept.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TABLE II</th>
<th>DIFFERENCE BETWEEN TOTAL SELF-CONCEPT OF GIFTED POPULATION AND AVERAGE POPULATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GIFTED POPULATION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>61.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>t-statistic</td>
<td>2.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degree of Freedom</td>
<td>.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Significance</td>
<td>.004</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Hypothesis 2

The null hypothesis that there is no statistically significant difference between gifted children's self-perceived behavior and average children's self-perceived behavior was rejected. Table III shows the behavior mean of the gifted population was 14.12 while the average population mean was 11.44. This difference was significant at the 0.000 level.

Table III

DIFFERENCE BETWEEN SELF-PERCEIVED BEHAVIOR OF GIFTED POPULATION AND AVERAGE POPULATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GIFTED POPULATION</th>
<th>AVERAGE POPULATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>14.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>t-statistic</td>
<td>7.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degrees of Freedom</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Significance</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Hypothesis 3

The null hypothesis that there is no statistically significant difference between self-perceived intellectual and school status of gifted children and average children was rejected at the 0.000 level of significance. Table IV shows that the mean of the gifted population was 14.16 while the average population had a mean of 11.62. It was concluded that there was a significant difference between self-perceived intellectual and school status
of gifted and average children.

TABLE IV

DIFFERENCE BETWEEN SELF-PERCEIVED INTELLECTUAL AND SCHOOL STATUS OF GIFTED POPULATION AND AVERAGE POPULATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>GIFTED POPULATION</th>
<th>AVERAGE POPULATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>14.12</td>
<td>11.62</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ t \text{-statistic} = 6.70 \]
\[ \text{Degrees of Freedom} = 63 \]
\[ \text{Significance} = .000 \]

Hypothesis 4

The null hypothesis that no statistically significant difference exists between gifted children's self-perceived physical appearance and attributes and average children's self-perceived physical appearance and attributes as measured by the t-test, was rejected. As Table V indicates, the difference between the two populations regarding self-perceived physical appearance and attributes was significant at the 0.014 level of significance, which is sufficient to be statistically significant. Table V also displays the differences between the gifted population's mean of 9.34 and that of the average population's mean of 8.31. It was concluded that gifted children's self-perceived physical appearance and attributes were significantly different from that of average children's self-perceived appearance and attributes.
TABLE V
DIFFERENCE BETWEEN SELF-PERCEIVED PHYSICAL APPEARANCE AND ATTRIBUTES OF GIFTED POPULATION AND AVERAGE POPULATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>GIFTED POPULATION</th>
<th>AVERAGE POPULATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>9.34</td>
<td>8.31</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[
t\text{-statistic... 2.52}  \\
\text{Degrees of Freedom... 63}  \\
\text{Significance... 0.014}
\]

Hypothesis 5
The null hypothesis that there is no statistically significant difference between gifted children's anxiety and average children's anxiety was rejected. As indicated in Table VI, the difference between the gifted and average children's anxiety was at the 0.013 level of significance. Also shown in Table VI is the mean of each population. The gifted children had a mean of 10.56 compared to the average children's mean of 9.54. It was concluded that a difference did exist between gifted children's anxiety and average children's anxiety.
TABLE VI
DIFFERENCE BETWEEN ANXIETY OF GIFTED POPULATION AND AVERAGE POPULATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>GIFTED POPULATION</th>
<th>AVERAGE POPULATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>10.56</td>
<td>9.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>t-statistic</td>
<td>2.55</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degrees of Freedom</td>
<td>63</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Significance</td>
<td>0.013</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Hypothesis 6

The null hypothesis that there is no statistically significant difference between gifted children's self-perceived popularity and average children's self-perceived popularity was accepted. Table VII indicates that the t-test results of the gifted children's self-perceived popularity and average children's self-perceived popularity as measured by the t-test. The mean of the gifted population was 8.42 compared to the average population's mean of 8.27. The significance level of 0.678 was not statistically significant at the 0.05 level. It was concluded that there was no statistically significant difference between gifted children's self-perceived popularity and average children's self-perceived popularity.
TABLE VII
DIFFERENCE BETWEEN SELF-PERCEIVED POPULARITY OF GIFTED POPULATION AND SELF-PERCEIVED POPULARITY OF AVERAGE POPULATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>GIFTED POPULATION</th>
<th>AVERAGE POPULATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>8.42</td>
<td>8.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>t-statistic</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degrees of Freedom</td>
<td>63</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Significance</td>
<td>0.678</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Hypothesis 7

The null hypothesis that there is no statistically significant difference between gifted children's happiness and satisfaction and average children's happiness and satisfaction was rejected at the 0.041 level of significance. Table VIII reveals the happiness and satisfaction mean of the gifted population was 8.59 compared to the 8.05 mean of the average population. It was concluded that there was a statistically significant difference between the happiness and satisfaction of gifted children and happiness and satisfaction of average children.
TABLE VII

DIFFERENCE BETWEEN HAPPINESS AND SATISFACTION OF GIFTED POPULATION AND HAPPINESS AND SATISFACTION OF AVERAGE POPULATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>GIFTED POPULATION</th>
<th>AVERAGE POPULATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>8.59</td>
<td>8.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>t-statistic</td>
<td>2.09</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degrees of Freedom</td>
<td>63</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Significance</td>
<td>0.041</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary

Table IX shows the mean for both the gifted population and average population along with the significance level for each of the seven areas tested.
TABLE IX
TOTAL COMPARISON OF MEAN AND SIGNIFICANCE LEVEL FOR EACH AREA TESTED

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>GPM</th>
<th>APM</th>
<th>SL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Self-Concept</td>
<td>61.59</td>
<td>56.04</td>
<td>0.004*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Perceived Behavior</td>
<td>14.12</td>
<td>11.44</td>
<td>0.000*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Perceived Intellect and School Status</td>
<td>14.16</td>
<td>11.62</td>
<td>0.000*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Perceived Physical Appearance and Attributes</td>
<td>9.34</td>
<td>8.31</td>
<td>0.014*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anxiety</td>
<td>10.56</td>
<td>9.54</td>
<td>0.013*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Perceived Popularity</td>
<td>8.42</td>
<td>8.27</td>
<td>0.678</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Happiness and Satisfaction</td>
<td>8.59</td>
<td>8.05</td>
<td>0.041*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Significant at the 0.05 level

GPM = Gifted Population Mean
APM = Average Population Mean
SL = Significance Level

The analysis of the data indicated that all null hypotheses were rejected except for null hypothesis six, which stated that there is no statistically significant difference between gifted children's self-perceived popularity and average children's self-perceived popularity. This null hypothesis was accepted.
CHAPTER V
SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

Although there is an abundance of literature on the topic of self-concepts of gifted children, there is no conclusive evidence displaying the relationship between giftedness and self-concept.

The problem of this study was to determine the difference that exists between gifted children's self-concepts and the self-concepts of average children as measured by the Piers-Harris Children's Self-Concept Scale (Piers, 52).

The specific procedures used were as follows:

1. The author reviewed the literature pertaining to the relationship between giftedness and children's self-concept.

2. Seven null hypotheses were formulated.

3. The author, with the help of trained assistants, administered the Piers-Harris Children's Self-Concept Scale to the children enrolled in the 1986 Carroll College Gifted Institute.

4. After collecting the data, the author tabulated the gifted students' scores according to the scoring procedure stated in the Piers-Harris Children's Self-Concept Scale Manual.
5. The gifted students' scores were compared to the cluster scale norm's sample as recorded by Piers-Harris (Piers, 52-50) using the t-test.

6. An alpha level of 0.05 was established for statistically significant differences.

**Results and Conclusions**

The hypotheses and conclusions are presented below:

**Null hypothesis 1.** The null hypothesis that there is no statistically significant difference between gifted children's total self-concept and average children's total self-concept was rejected. It was concluded that there was a significant difference between gifted children's total self-concept and average children's total self-concept.

**Null hypothesis 2.** The null hypothesis that there is no significant difference between gifted children's self-perceived behavior and average children's self-perceived behavior could not be accepted. It was concluded that there was a significant difference between gifted children's and average children's self-perceived behavior at the .05 level of significance.

**Null hypothesis 3.** The null hypothesis that there is no statistically significant difference between self-perceived intellectual and school status of gifted children and self-perceived intellectual and school status of average children was rejected at the .05 level of confidence. It was concluded that there was a significant difference
between gifted children's and average children's self-perceived intellectual and school status.

Null hypothesis 4. The null hypothesis that there is no statistically significant difference between gifted children's self-perceived physical appearance and attributes and average children's self-perceived physical appearance and attributes as measured by the t-test was not accepted. It was concluded that there was a significant difference between the self-perceived physical appearance and attributes of gifted children and self-perceived physical appearance and attributes of average children.

Null hypothesis 5. The null hypothesis that there is no significant difference between gifted children's anxiety and average children's anxiety was rejected. It was concluded that there was a statistically significant difference between gifted children's anxiety and average children's anxiety.

Null hypothesis 6. The null hypothesis that there is no significant difference between gifted children's self-perceived popularity and average children's self-perceived popularity was accepted. It was concluded that there is no significant difference between the self-perceived popularity of gifted children and self-perceived popularity of average children.

Null hypothesis 7. The null hypothesis that there is no statistically significant difference between gifted children's happiness and satisfaction and average children's
happiness and satisfaction could not be accepted at the .05 level of confidence. It was concluded that there was a statistically significant difference between the happiness and satisfaction of gifted children and the happiness and satisfaction of average children.

Limitations

The population of gifted children was limited to those children who had been identified as mentally gifted and who attended the 1986 Carroll College Gifted Institute. The "average" population was limited to 485 children selected by Piers-Harris.

The measurement of the self-concept was limited to those items measured by the Piers-Harris Children's Self-Concept Scale.

Finally, the overall study was limited by the reliability and validity of the Piers-Harris Children's Self-Concept Scale.

Implications

The data obtained in this study have a number of implications concerning the self-concepts of gifted children. The implications are discussed below.

1. A statistically significant difference was found between the gifted and average population's self-perceived intellectual and school status. This generates the question, is school status then based primarily on academic achievement? This would imply that gifted children, who have higher I.Q.'s, feel better about themselves than
average children, because of their superior academic abilities.

2. Table IX shows that the anxiety level mean of the gifted population to be higher than the average population's mean. This may be a result of high expectations placed upon the gifted children by themselves, by schools, by society, or by their families. This may imply that high expectations placed on gifted children have a negative effect on their self-concept.

3. The gifted population had a higher mean score of self-perceived popularity than did the average population. Do gifted children's feelings of popularity change with the peer group in which they are interacting? Perhaps gifted children feel better about themselves when they are with other gifted children rather than when with a varied peer group.

4. This study revealed that the gifted population had greater feelings of happiness and satisfaction than did the average population. Perhaps segregating gifted children from their average peers has a positive effect on their self-concept. The results of the study would imply that segregation does not have a negative effect on the self-concept of gifted children.

5. The statistics obtained concerning the significant difference between gifted and average children's happiness and satisfaction may also be a result of greater parental support than that of the average children. This may imply
that parental support has a great influence on the happiness and satisfaction of children.

6. There is a statistically significant difference between the total self-concepts of the gifted and average populations, with the gifted having a higher mean score. This could imply that giftedness, in itself, causes a child to have a higher self-concept. It may also be that gifted children are exposed to different environments which produce higher self-concepts.

**Recommendations for Further Research**

In view of the results of this study, the following recommendations are suggested:

1. The present study should be replicated using different populations.

2. Further studies should be conducted investigating the effect giftedness has on children's self-concepts.

3. The test should be readministered to the same gifted population in their usual scholastic setting, with a "normal" group.

4. Further research should be conducted to reveal how much more pressure is actually placed upon gifted children than placed upon average children.

5. Further studies should be conducted to reveal the effects segregation has on gifted children.

6. It is recommended that further research be implemented to determine the differences in parental support between gifted children and average children.
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