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CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

It is well to 'do good' to others, but it is much better to do this by securing for them the 'freedom' which makes it possible for them to get along in a future without such altruism from others.

Stallings, 1975 p. 41

Many will agree that the greatest wealth of talent lies with the intellectually gifted and talented individual. They are the nation's potential leaders, inventors, and problem solvers. The belief that society will benefit from the work of these relatively few persons has served as a stimulus for the resurging interest in addressing the educational needs of gifted and talented children.

While much is known about the gifted child, and about the disadvantaged child, comparatively little is known about the disadvantaged gifted youth. There is a scarcity of research available concerning talented and gifted children among disadvantaged groups (Gowan, 1968; Widdup, 1980). An enormous individual and societal loss occurs when children are not discovered and their talents nurtured (Marland, 1972; Gallagher, 1975).

Passow (1972, p. 24) writes that:

There is a firm belief that children from low-income, ethnic, and racial minority groups represent the nation's largest unmined source of talent. Aside from the humanitarian aspects of overcoming poverty and discrimination, aside from the moral values in providing equal opportunity for all, the nation's
welfare and survival depends on its success in identifying and nuturing talents of many kinds wherever they may be found.

Efforts to identify these students and aid in their development have been limited in the past (Gallegos, 1973). But there has been a gradual increase and gain in momentum in the recognition that there are gifted children in all cultural and socio-economic groups. In addition to this there is a developing consciousness regarding how to effectively educate and cultivate disadvantaged gifted students once they have been identified.

Creativity has recently been viewed as a way of identifying giftedness in disadvantaged children (Johnson, 1976; Bruch, 1975). It is seen as an attractive alternative to intelligence testing which is considered by many as having overtones of cultural bias (Swensen, 1978; Hilliard, 1976). Houston (1973) in a study of story-repeating ability found that poor test performance by disadvantaged children was actually a result of their creative thinking ability. Creativity according to Smith (1965) and Torrance (1971) occurs to a high degree among this group. The creative positives possessed by these children should be recognized and used as a vehicle for helping them to maximize all of their potentials.

Providing for affective as well as cognitive growth of students should be integrated into the total school program. One area of concern is the need to understand the general problems faced by the disadvantaged gifted student. Which of these problems the student needs counseling in the most is the second area of concern. Group counseling has been advocated as a method of working with disadvantaged students (Schaeffer and
Von Nessen, 1968; Duncan and Gadza, 1963). Counseling to improve self-concepts and build leadership skills may better prepare disadvantaged gifted students for holding future leadership roles.

Because concentrated efforts to identify disadvantaged students of high intellectual ability have only taken place in recent years, little has been written or attempted in the area of counseling this specific group. This research project is an effort to provide greater awareness and understanding, as well as additional knowledge of this area of concern facing education.

Statement of the Problem

The purpose of this study is to answer the following questions:

1. Will participation in a program of structured group counseling affect the self-concept test scores and leadership test scores of disadvantaged gifted elementary students?

2. After participating in a program of structured group counseling, will high creative students achieve a greater gain in self-concept and leadership test scores than low creative disadvantaged gifted students?

3. Is there a significant relationship between creative thinking ability, self-concept, and leadership skills of disadvantaged gifted students?

Theoretical Rationale

Many personality theorists have the belief that man can make worthwhile contributions to society and self when he is functioning at his
fullest potential. The fully functioning person according to Carl Rogers is creative, allows full outlet of potentials and has a positive self regard:

When man is less than fully man . . . then indeed we have too often reason to fear his behavior, as the present world situation testifies. But when he is most fully man, when he is his complete organism . . . then he is to be trusted, then his behavior is constructive (1961, p. 105).

In his theory, Erich Fromm (1947) holds that man has a productive orientation, which is a mode of relatedness to the world in which one develops and utilizes his potentialities as fully as possible. Similarly, Maslow's (1970) "self-actualization" means fulfilling one's genetic potential, growing to the fullest. It is the full use of talents, capacities, and potentials. This state of self-actualization is achieved through a process of "health growth" in which factors such as intellectual, emotional, and social competencies play a critical part.

Carl Jung (1964) writes that the individuation process is the development and growth of the person. Given the proper condition, there is a natural unfolding. Just as a seed needs light and moisture to grow into a particular plant or tree, so also a human being requires favorable conditions to become what he can become. With man, however, there is a difference: The ego must participate if fullness of growth is to be achieved. Only a certain amount of growth occurs naturally. One must work to perfect a talent. A man with a talent for art will only develop it if he recognizes it and consciously works to express and perfect it.
The undiscovered or underachieving gifted student has not been given an opportunity for maximum development of talents. Many disadvantaged children fall into the category of the under-developed. The child who achieves a healthy and positive self-concept as well as fulfilling his leadership potential will be able as an adult to contribute to society in constructive and beneficial ways. Much of the responsibility for helping them to do this lies with the schools.

**General Hypotheses**

1. There will be a significantly greater increase in self-concept and leadership skills for disadvantaged gifted students who participate in a program of structured group counseling compared to those who do not.

2. Among students who participate in a program of structured group counseling, there will be a significantly greater increase in self-concept and leadership skills for high creative students compared to low creative students.

3. There will be a significant relationship between creative thinking ability, self-concept, and leadership skills of disadvantaged gifted students.

**Research Hypotheses**

1. There will be a significantly higher mean gain score on self-concept for disadvantaged gifted students who participate in a program of structured group counseling compared to the control group as measured by the Piers-Harris Children's Self-Concept Scale (PHCSCS).
2. There will be a significantly higher mean gain score on leadership for disadvantaged gifted students who participate in a program of structured group counseling compared to the control groups as measured by the Scales for Rating the Behavioral Characteristics of Superior Students, Part IV, Leadership Characteristics (SRBCSS).

3. There will be a statistically significant correlation between creative thinking test scores, self-concept test scores, and leadership test scores for disadvantaged gifted students within the experimental and control groups as measured by the (a) Torrance Tests of Creative Thinking (TTCT), (b) PHCSCS, and (c) SRBCSS, Part IV, Leadership Characteristics.

4. Within the experimental group only, the high creative students will have a significantly higher mean gain score on self-concept than will the low creative students as measured by the PHCSCS.

5. Within the experimental group only, the high creative students will have a significantly higher mean gain score on leadership than will the low creative students as measured by the SRBCSS, Part IV, Leadership Characteristics.

Definition of Terms

For the purpose of this study the following definitions have been selected:

Creative thinking - is defined by Torrance (1973; 1977) as a natural human process in which a person becomes aware of a problem, difficulty, or gap in information for which he has no learned responses: Searches
for possible solutions from his own past experiences and those of others; formulates hypotheses about possible solutions and tests them; modifies them and retests them; and communicates the results to others. The end product may be verbal, nonverbal, concrete, and/or abstract.

Disadvantaged gifted student - A disadvantaged gifted student shall be identified as "economically disadvantaged" through attendance at a school designated as "Title I." Schools or "target areas" listed under Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (ESEA) are selected by the local education agency under federal guidelines. The requirements for Title I status are as follows: To be eligible, a school must serve an attendance area containing a high concentration of children from low income families. This may be determined by choosing a single data source (e.g., census data or AFDC data) or by using a combination of sources. Secondary sources that may be used include health, housing, free lunch, employment statistics, or a local survey. Although the agency chooses its data sources according to its own circumstances, it must apply the same criteria district-wide. The agency determines for each school both the number of children from low income families and the average percentage of children from such families. It ranks the schools by number and by percentage of children and compares these figures with the district averages in both categories. Eligible schools are then determined. Sometimes referred to as educationally deprived or educationally disadvantaged, some of these children may speak a language other than English or may be victims of inadequate health care, or lack of proper nutrition which hampers their mental and physical development as well as educational performance.
A gifted student is that student who has satisfied the criteria set forth by the Chesapeake Public Schools Gifted and Talented Program and has been identified as gifted and talented through standard identification procedures. These procedures are as follows: The student must be nominated by a teacher or his or her parents. He or she must then take the Cognitive Abilities Test and the Welsh Figure Preference Test. An Adjective Checklist is completed for the student by the teacher. All scores along with the student's reading placement and any other pertinent information is recorded on a Gifted Academic Matrix and run through a locally developed prediction equation. This equation gives a single score that is made up of all the data collected. Each student is individually reviewed by an eligibility committee to determine final placement.

For the purposes of this study, a disadvantaged gifted student is defined as that student who meets all of the above requirements.

Leadership - Leadership refers to the unusual abilities, skills, and sensitivities for influencing others toward the attainment of socially, valuable goals.

Self-concept - according to Byrne (1974), self-concept may be defined as the total collection of attitudes, values, and judgments an individual holds with respect to his behavior, his ability, his body, and his worth as a person—in short, how he perceives and evaluates himself.

Limitations of the Investigation

This study was limited to fifth- and sixth-grade students identified as potentially gifted and talented and who attended a Title I elementary
school of significantly high population of economically disadvantaged children. Results should be generalized only to students of similar schools and backgrounds.
CHAPTER 2

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

This chapter reviews the literature pertinent to the present study of disadvantaged gifted elementary students. The review is divided into the following sections:

1. The disadvantaged gifted in education;
2. Creativity and the disadvantaged gifted;
3. Self-concept and the disadvantaged gifted;
4. Leadership potential and the disadvantaged gifted;
5. Counseling the disadvantaged gifted; and,
6. Summary statement

The Disadvantaged Gifted in Education

Not until recently have there been efforts to provide for that small segment of the population, the gifted and talented student. If there has been an inability or unwillingness to provide for the particular needs of the gifted, this neglect has been even more widespread among disadvantaged and minority groups (Passow, 1972).

Disadvantaged, according to Brickman and Lehrer (1972) includes a variety of persons who have not been able to enjoy culture and education to the fullest on account of various disabilities whether social, ideological, religious, economic, or any other origin. Baldwin (1978) views the disadvantaged as those who are deprived of the opportunity to develop their mental capacities because of cultural diversity—a condition of
racial, ethnic, language, or physical difference from a dominant culture; socio-economic deprivation; or geographical isolation.

The nation's largest untapped source of human intelligence and creativity is to be found among the large numbers of disadvantaged individuals (Renzulli, 1971; Torrance, 1978). Passow (1972) has written, in a position paper prepared for the White House Conference on Children and Youth (1960), that one of the most pressing problem areas in education of the gifted and talented was improvement of procedures for locating these students at an early age to prevent negative attitudes, learning patterns, and self-concepts from forming and choking his abilities.

Gifted and talented children can be found in all racial groups and socio-economic levels. Niles (1954) reported that many high IQ black children could be found in black communities. Jenkins (1948) and Witty and Jenkins (1934) found that race is not a limiting factor in intellectual development. Hunt (1961), Bloom (1965), Frasier (1978), and others have brought to light the significant role environment plays in intellectual development.

Gallagher (1975) states that there is a great deal of frustration for disadvantaged children who find themselves inhibited by bias and limitations beyond their control. Because these students are caught in a spiral of educational and environmental forces working against the identification and nurturing of their talents, they often demonstrate failure and dissatisfaction rather than talent and ability. Frasier (1979) states that, "The challenge in educating disadvantaged gifted youth should be to develop potential, not to wish conformity to one model of giftedness with all else being deficient." (p. 539).
There has been a recent impetus in the development of methods for discovering children whose limited experience may camouflage their abilities and cause them to score lower on intelligence tests.

One of the first breakthroughs in recognizing the limitations of standard IQ testing came with Guilford's Structure of Intellect (SOI) theory (1956). The SOI is a model separating intelligence into 120 defined intellectual abilities. Guilford wrote that IQ tests helped to foster the false conviction that intelligence is a broad, unitary ability. Contrary to this, his SOI model viewed intelligence as a composite of many different abilities and that no person is equally strong in all of them. The traditional IQ test assesses only a limited number of them, usually the capacity to manipulate verbal symbols and abstractions at the expense of the other intellectual abilities.

Based on Guilford's theory, Meeker (1969) suggested relating IQ test responses to the various abilities set forth in the SOI model. This would help make intelligence measuring instruments more diagnostically useful for designing instructional strategies.

Baldwin (1975) discussed awareness of the environmental, sociological, or cultural differences of individuals and the influences of these as considerations in the measurement of intelligence. The Baldwin Identification Matrix (Baldwin, A. and Wooster, J., 1977) uses these factors in obtaining a total score for the child.

In 1971, Mercer discussed an evaluation procedure devised for the purpose of assessing the whole child in terms of family size, family structure, socio-economic status and urban acculturation. The System of Multi-Cultural Pluralistic Assessment developed by Mercer and Lewis
(1978) takes into account differences between the culture of standard norms (the school) and the culture background of the child. An Estimated Learning Potential (ELP) is provided through a system of statistical analysis using differential weighting of behaviors and performance.

Other methods include the **Alpha Biographical Inventory** developed by Taylor and Associates (1966/68) which is a 300 item life experience inventory used to identify gifted individuals among disadvantaged populations; and the **Abbreviated Binet for Disadvantaged** (ABDA) devised by Bruch (1971) which yields a score derived from selected items on the Stanford-Binet that are biased toward disadvantaged black children.

There have also been efforts to find educational procedures for effectively working with disadvantaged gifted children. Karnes and others (1965) conducted a research study to determine the psycho-educational characteristics of bright disadvantaged students and the implication of these characteristics for an effective educational program. Intelligence tests were administered to children from six elementary schools within a disadvantaged school district. The 203 students who scored within the top twenty percent of this population were selected as the experimental study group. Data was obtained from standardized tests and diagnostic case studies of each child. Among the findings were: (1) cultural deprivation depresses intellectual functioning, and (2) subjects were found to already be educationally deficient at age five. Recommendations were as follows: Schools should make efforts to provide intellectual stimulation. Preschool for ages two to three, stressing verbal skills, should be considered. Services of school psychologists to assist teachers in assessing learning problems...
should be provided as well as experiences to improve self-images. Positive relationships between parents, teachers, and students should be encouraged. More research to determine educational strategies should be undertaken.

Frasier (1978) contends that the culturally different gifted many times show weaknesses in the skill areas necessary for cognitive growth--verbal and semantic skills. However, they can solve problems intuitively, without being able to verbalize them. This suggests the use of teaching techniques accommodating a variety of cognitive styles. Much of the information that culturally different gifted children attend to may be considered irrelevant to school success. The educational implications are that they can be taught to attend to relevant stimuli that has a strong utility value in the ultimate reaching of their potential. The best way to motivate the unmotivated child is to ignore his motivational state for the time being and focus on teaching him as effectively as possible. Recognizing them for their superior capabilities for acquiring symbols necessary for abstract conceptualizations is limited only by their lack of experience from an environment that does not provide it for them.

Passow (1965) pointed out that there is a need for differentiated opportunities to develop the special abilities of these students. He advocates the mini or prep school in ghetto areas as one worth exploring. Ability grouping that leads to tracking systems that segregate white middle-class students from poor nonwhite students leading the former into college and the latter to a dead end does not contribute to full development of talents. There should be attention given to the social/emotional
as well as educational development of the child, thus creating a climate for achievement. Learning opportunities in nonconventional settings involving nontraditional personnel should be encouraged. The entire community should become a center of learning. Expectations of school staffs toward this group should be altered through staff development procedures.

Affective education of these students was emphasized by Gowen (1968). He stated that attending to development in this area as well as cognitive development will create a climate for achievement. Such programs will provide another chance for able pupils who have been missed or turned off by the more traditional programs.

**Creativity and the Disadvantaged Gifted**

No one agreed upon definition of creativity can be cited. Of the many different theories and points of views, none are universally accepted (Treffinger, Renzulli, and Fieldhosen, 1971).

Creativity may be understood in terms of a novel or infrequent response, idea, or product that can be realistically applied (Gallagher, 1975; Mackinnon, 1962). Maslow (1963) defines creativity in terms of an inspired subjective experience. Kneller (1965) states that the act of creating calls into play motivation, perception, learning, thinking, and communicating. Getzels (1975) proposes the following definition for creative thinking:

1) If the product has novelty and value either for the thinker or the culture;

2) the thinking is unconventional;
3) it is highly motivated and persistent or of great intensity; and,
4) the problem was initially vague and undefined so that part
   of the task was to formulate the problem itself. (p. 328).

Creativity has been defined by Gowan (1971) in terms of five dis-

tinct views:

1) Cognitive, rational and semantic: problem-solving views
   of the Buffalo School, the Guilford Structure of Intellect
   and others.
2) Personality and environmental: child-rearing practices,
   personality correlates, originality, energy and high self-
   concept.
3) Mental health: Rogerian, Maslovian self-actualization
   view.
4) Freudian and neo-Freudian: psychoanalytic, oepidal plea-
   sure and preconscious.
5) Psychedelic: existential, non-rational and cosmic con-
   sciousness. (p. 242).

In Mackinnon's (1964) study of highly creative architects, panels of
qualified judges in the field of architecture rated a pool of nominees
using the following criteria:

1) Originality of thinking and freshness of approaches to
   architectural problems;
2) construct ingenuity;
3) ability to set aside established conventions and procedures when appropriate; and,

4) a flair for devising effective and original fulfillments of technology, visual form, planning, human awareness and social purpose.

It is probably more practical to consider creativity a general term comprised of many specific components. Each of these may be present in differing degrees in all people: Thus all persons are not equally creative though all possess some potential for the expression of creative behavior (Borgers and Treffinger, 1979).

A study by Gowan and Bruch (1967) located the following personal factors among highly creative teachers: 1) energy; (2) courage; (3) mental health and abstinence of neurotic traits; 4) adaptive intelligence; and, 5) originality and nonconformity. Draper (1980) uses these along with other characteristics put forth by Taylor's (1964) biographical studies of creative persons, in recognizing the creative potential of disadvantaged and minority students. He writes that the same characteristics can be applied to these students:

1. Are more independent in making judgments and willing to stand alone for the sake of accuracy.
2. Are more self-assertive and dominant.
3. Are more progressive and radical, adventurous and capable of taking greater risks.
4. Are more resourceful.
5. Are able to tolerate a great deal of ambiguity.
6. Have a need for variety and prefer complexity. (p. 172)
Fifteen research studies by Torrance (1971) focused on the creative abilities of low socio-economic and minority group children. The studies indicated that although whites surpassed blacks on verbal messages, there were no significant differences on scores of figural fluency, flexibility, and originality, and in some cases the disadvantaged groups surpassed the middle class groups. Torrance (1971) expressed the opinion that in many ways the life experiences of disadvantaged children may actually be more supportive of creative achievement than the experiences of more advantaged children. "Their lack of expensive toys and play materials contributes to their skill in improvising with common materials. The large families and life styles of disadvantaged children develop skills in group activities and problem solving." (p. 79)

Through his studies of disadvantaged groups, Torrance (1964, 1968) identified a set of creative positives that occur to a high degree among disadvantaged children:

1. high non-verbal fluency and originality;
2. high creative productivity in small groups;
3. adept in visual art activities;
4. highly creative in movement, dance, and other physical activities;
5. highly motivated by games, music, sports, humor and concrete objects; and,
6. language rich in imagery.

Smith (1965) in his studies also found that children from disadvantaged backgrounds did well in creativity; fluency and flexibility in response to divergent thinking questions.
Gowan (1975) contends that acting against the identification of high intelligence in disadvantaged children is a powerful factor; low socio-economic status. A factor which sustains talent against the adverse effects of environment is almost always creative potential. Torrance (1969) proposed that these creatives can be used to build successful educational programs for awakening potentialities among these children.

Balcerak (1968) indicates the importance of creativity and leadership in selecting the gifted from a predominantly disadvantaged urban population. Developing creativity and leadership qualities is a key goal in the education of students at the Kelly Junior High School, a Catholic school designed for the purpose of educating disadvantaged gifted boys. Admission policy at the school is based on an entrance examination, personal interview, IQ evaluation, reading and achievement scores, and teacher and principal recommendations in the areas of leadership and creativity. The program consists of regular periods for work on unstructured projects where students can utilize and develop creativity. Guidance services are provided. Only one of 165 students dropped out after the first two years.

Self-Concept and the Disadvantaged Gifted

Rogers (1951) points out that self-concept is not a single perception but an organization of perceptions. A child's self-concept is formed and internalized by means of interactions with others. He perceives and evaluates himself as he feels others do.

There have been several studies that show that a positive self-concept is important in the learning process (Bloom, 1977; Kifer, 1973;
Jones and Stowig, 1968). Torshen (1969) after reviewing many studies on academic self-concept found that the relationship between academic self-concept and school was approximately +.50. In her own study she found a correlation of +.46 among fifth grade students.

Studies also show that the lower the level of self-esteem, the lower the level of achievement (Whiteman and Deutsch, 1967); Brookover and Erickson, 1969); Anastasiow, (1967). Thus enhancing the self-concept of students will likely enhance their ability to learn and achieve (Exum and Colangelo, 1979).

Coopersmith (cited in Schubert and Biondi, 1977) states:

The importance of self-esteem for creative expression appears to be almost beyond disproof... Without trust in his own powers, the person seeking improved solutions or alternative theories has no basis for distinguishing the significant and profound innovation from one that is merely different. (p. 189)

Maslow (1968) and Kris (1952) also support the relationship between creativity and self-esteem or mental health. Williams (1976) found that high personal self-concept of fourth grade students, together with a treatment may have helped to offset initial low school self-concept.

Although gifted students appear to be popular and well adjusted in elementary school, research indicates that they tend to underevaluate themselves (Werblo, 1966). In general they are likely to encounter problems in the school setting such as teachers who do not value the attribute of creativity which promotes independent attitudes and social behavior (Torrance, 1962; Gallagher, 1975). Disapproval by significant
persons such as teachers, parents, or peers results in lowered self-esteem (Bickford, 1978).

Colangelo and Exum (1979) state that while a positive self-concept is important for all children, it appears to be pertinent to the development of the disadvantaged gifted. The consequences of cognitive differences in disadvantaged children are complicated by their patterns of motivation and attitudes. They often feel alienated, a situation induced by family climate and experiences, combined with a debilitating low self-concept. They tend to question their own worth, to fear being challenged, and to exhibit a desire to cling to the familiar (Sisk, 1975). These students are in a double bind in that they face situations of flux and conflict between their learning needs and the expectations of their peers and cultural background. This very often takes the form of alienation by contemporaries for achievement which is seen as disloyalty to the group.

Gomez (1978) lists the following negative traits usually found in disadvantaged culturally different gifted children:

1. lack of confidence in ability;
2. feelings of inadequacy;
3. low self-esteem and negative self-concept;
4. insecurity;
5. frustration because of cultural differences; and,
6. feelings of rejection. (p. 61)

Thompson (1972) cites four studies of disadvantaged junior high school students using the Tennessee Self-Concept Scale in which a marked degree of consistency in profiles was found: Faunce (1967) reported
scores for a group of 72 disadvantaged seventh and eighth graders from public schools in Minneapolis; Alexander (1969) studied a group of 150 12-to 15-year old boys from low income families in Somerville, Massachusetts; Mitchell (1967) studied a group of 84 junior high boys and girls in Norfolk, Virginia. The self-concept profiles of these four groups of students were markedly consistent. They all had below average Total P Scores falling between 319.5 and 324.5; below the 50th percentile.

Lack of confidence, limited knowledge of strengths and weaknesses, limited knowledge of career opportunities open to them, and lack of counseling can lead to eventual frustration, decreased productivity and withdrawal for the disadvantaged gifted student. The role of the educator is one of the greatest influences in the development of their potential (Gomez, 1978).

Leadership Potential and the Disadvantaged Gifted

In the 1971 Report to Congress on Education of the Gifted and Talented, the definition of giftedness was expanded to include leadership potential. The report stated that among student characteristics of creativity and problem-solving abilities, leadership potential should be a viable and positive concern (Olivero, 1978).

There has been a growing recognition of leadership as a significant aspect of human behavior. Guilford (1968) wrote about the great need for leaders and inquired how leadership potential might be discovered and developed. Gowan (1962) commented on the waste of talent in our society. Passow and Schiff (1978) state:
Society has a need for individuals who are intelligent, educated, and motivated to provide leadership through planning, creating, inventing, teaching, and building. We need philosophers and physicists, teachers and technicians, historians and humanists, mathematicians and musicians, executives and engineers as well as a variety of other gifted and talented individuals, all of whom exercise leadership by virtue of their superior achievement and performance in socially valuable areas of endeavor. (p. iii)

Efforts should be put into ways and means of developing leadership ability in today's youth, particularly the gifted and talented. Resources used to meet these needs will be returned to society through individual achievements and leadership accomplishments.

Isaacs (1973) reinforces the need for leadership through the following:

1. A good leader can make the members of a group feel secure, needed, wanted, and happily, creatively, productive.
2. These experiences add up to sound mental health.
3. If good mental health prevailed in the land, what a difference we would experience in the quality of the environment.
4. Gifted, constructive leadership can increase the number who can function giftedly, qualitatively, and quantitatively, rewarding us all. (p. 111)

Leadership may be looked at in terms of what a person is—physical traits, abilities, personality, or how he behaves—his performance and
methods, in a particular situation. Gowen and Demos (1962) define leadership as a complex social phenomenon, part personal, but also part social. Cavedon (1975) defines leadership as "the force by which an individual exerts an influence in releasing, channeling, and controlling the thoughts, energies, and emotions of himself and others." She states:

This force may be direct or indirect. We also know that this leadership force may be constructive depending on its interlocking factors. That is, the individual's personality, knowledge, or special capacity, talent, or acquired skill as well as problem-solving powers, creative imagination, character and experience, strongly affect the quality of leadership. (p. 26)

Plowman (1981) comments on leadership potential among gifted and talented youth by writing:

Leaders are persons who get the other persons to act--often to accomplish specific short-term objectives. Extraordinary leaders are persons who get other persons to resolve complex situations and problems and to attain long-range goals. They generate brilliant ideas and plans. The extraordinary leader uses expertise from a number of sources, discovers and develops latent capabilities of followers, ferrets out the real problem from a host of apparent problems, and is quick to communicate solutions. At times this type of leader organizes work and solves problems in ways which seem bizarre, but actually result in greater achievement than with traditional methods. (p. 13)
It is usually believed that disadvantaged children are not interested in the future and are not easily motivated to learn about the future or holding positions of leadership. Evidence of research by Torrance and Allen indicates that disadvantaged groups have special difficulties in developing adequate images of the future. Major efforts have been put into the Future Problem Solving Program developed by Torrance to attract disadvantaged groups. Children's images of the future help determine their leadership potential—what they will be motivated to learn and achieve; how they will live, cope, and grow in a high change society; their sense of identity; and the future of our society.

There is evidence that leadership can be taught. According to Fiedler's 1972 Contingency Model, leadership training can take one of two forms: 1) leaders can be given technical knowledge or management skills, or 2) leaders can be given human relations or sensitivity training. Depending on the situation, persons of average and above average intelligence should not have difficulty in developing these skills. Johnson (1978) states that leadership is inherent in everyone. In a survey of literature she cites several studies that emphasize that leadership can be taught: Carter, 1953; Zoleny, 1941; and Stogill, 1974, among others concluded that leadership can be created, trained and developed in persons of normal intelligence and emotional stability who are willing to make the effort to learn.

Sisk (1977) advocates the use of creative activities in leadership training. In this way the interpersonal skills that assist in the self-actualization process can be developed and maximum potential can be
achieved. Oral communication skills are an important aspect of leadership ability. Among all of the means of communication, sixty to eighty percent of a leader's time is spent in oral language (Sisk, 1977). Participation in small group activities where verbal interaction can occur should help develop these skills.

The Center for Creative Leadership in North Carolina (1975) conducted a Summer Institute which had stimulation of interest in creativity and leadership as one of its major goals. Within their philosophy were the following principles:

1. Learning by doing--making decisions, learning from mistakes, trying out new leadership behaviors and skills, and practicing those seen as most effective.
2. Learning from feedback--counseling regarding the individual's personality, skills, and leadership ability and potential.
3. Learning to change--self analysis, a constant flow of information being provided about participants through behavioral assessments, ratings on exercises, staff and peer observations to help individuals plan personal development. (p. 27)

Gowan believes that children can be led to creative leadership by helping them to:

1. learn to care for their physical and emotional needs, including love and self-esteem;
2. direct their aggressive drives into constructive channels;
3. win support, admiration and confidence;
4. learn to reward their own efforts and market their ideas;
   and,
5. promote positive mental health. (pp. 85-97)

Magoon (1981) proposes that leadership training for the gifted be:
1) programmatic and sequential from elementary through high school; 2) based upon the principles of participatory democracy—where leadership and followership are emphasized; and, 3) where leadership experiences are reinforced in real and simulated situations. Modeling by the instructor plays a crucial role.

An attempt to increase the social leadership skills of seventh and eighth grade gifted students was undertaken with the organization of the Interdisciplinary Leadership Training Program in Oakland, California in 1980. The program was designed to increase student's confidence by allowing them to operate in a decision-making capacity and to assume responsibility for their decisions (Gonsalves, Grimm, and Welsh, 1981). A pre-post survey of students and parents rated the program high as far as benefits received. Success of the program was also demonstrated by the high percentage of participants who ran for school offices, enrolled in long avoided journalism classes and entered contests and school productions the following year. Students' grades showed improvement and a gifted parent-support group was organized. Teachers, parents, and students requested continuance of the program.

In Yakima, Washington, gifted students focus on futuristic studies and leadership. The program, serving third through eighth grade students, gives them an opportunity to probe, experiment, hypothesize,
synthesize, and analyze in order to act and react with others. This attempt is to help prepare students for the future (Stacy and Mitchell, 1979).

While the literature offers much in the area of leadership training, there is very little geared toward development of leadership potential, particularly that of disadvantaged gifted students.

Counseling the Disadvantaged Gifted

Efforts to locate disadvantaged gifted students have only taken place within the last few years, thus research in the area of counseling this unique group is sparse. Two new points of interest in gifted education, distinguishing it from that of twenty years ago, are pointed out by Colangelo and Lafrenz (1981): 1) The new emphasis on affective development has generated a much more active role for counselors in assessing and meeting the counseling needs of the gifted; and, 2) Present interest is focused considerably more on identifying and meeting the needs of culturally diverse gifted.

The effects of guidance on disadvantaged students has received some attention with the JHS 43 - Manhattan Guidance Project. One of the first studies in this area, it found that large amounts of guidance seemed to have significant effects in holding academically gifted students in school and guiding them into college. Created in 1960, it was developed to identify and stimulate able students from a culturally deprived area to reach higher educational and vocational goals (Wrightson, 1960). These efforts improved motivation, reduced failure, and were generally very successful (Gowan, 1975). Guides were established for identifying
disadvantaged gifted youth, studies of culture-fair tests were undertaken, upward changes in verbal IQ's were revealed, and reading and math achievement was accelerated. Follow-up studies of students and parents revealed that the project raised student's aspirations and self-esteem, encouraged higher educational goals, and improved student achievement.

In New Rochelle, New York, a talent search project attempted to involve parents and students in a family counseling program in order to increase motivation for school performance and future planning (Zweibelson, 1965). In the preliminary survey, a sample of eighty-one ninth grade disadvantaged students were given the Differential Aptitude Test (DAT) and their parents were interviewed by a counselor. Families of forty students receiving high DAT scores participated in a program consisting of interviews, orientation sessions, individual counseling sessions, and group guidance sessions. Of the evaluation sheets received from 28 participating families, all but one felt he had been helped. The staff felt that they had increased sensitivity to the feelings and kinds of problems poor students and their families face. The six year project proved successful in its purposes and continued to use the same general format for the next four years.

Project Opportunity (Southern Association of College and Schools, 1968) was a talent search and encouragement program that attempted to identify disadvantaged students with academic potential. The purposes of the program were to: 1) increase academic performance; 2) decrease drop-out rate; 3) increase the number continuing in higher education; 4) increase knowledge of vocational opportunities; 5) improve self-images; 6) broaden cultural and recreational experiences; and, 7) encourage them
to remain in the South. Participants came from eleven areas in the southern half of the country. Identified in the seventh grade, they continued in the program for six years or until graduation from high school. Follow up studies revealed that changes took place in the regular curriculum as a result of the program. There were programs at improving communication in regular classes, and independent study by students in science and history. There was also a reduction in the drop-out rate.

An intensive two year project was conducted in East Harlem by New York's Community Services Society (McCabe, et al, 1967) to examine characteristics of intellectually superior disadvantaged students and to test the effectiveness of a demonstration service program employing group methods for encouraging academic and social functioning of the students. Eighty black and Puerto Rican children in grades two to four were randomly placed in experimental and control groups. Findings reported an increase in reading skills although effects in other areas were less conclusive.

In a study of a kindergarten home counseling program (Radin, 1969), matched groups of twelve disadvantaged high ability students who had previously participated in a pre-school program underwent differential kindergarten experiences. A parent counseling program was found to be the variable producing both superior performance on cognitive measures and a more stimulating home environment. The youngsters showing the greatest gains on the Binet were those whose mothers had been intensely involved in the educative process at both the pre-school and kindergarten levels.
Gowan (1971) reported that regular gifted students easily used the services of a counselor, but culturally diverse and economically disadvantaged gifted used counseling services more infrequently. Counselors should be active in initiating contacts and providing services for this special group. There should be a combined counseling and instructional approach to upgrade academic skills and help develop the personal skills of self-direction and control (Frasier, 1979).

Disadvantaged gifted youth must be assisted in recognizing and understanding what they know about themselves, their abilities and talents, and how this information affects decisions they make about their future (Frasier, 1979; Sullivan, 1973).

The counseling needs of culturally diverse and disadvantaged gifted children can be categorized into four main problem areas:

1. identity as a gifted person;
2. the difficulty in making academic and vocational decisions;
3. the problems of making social adjustments within their own culture and the dominant culture; and,
4. problems in facing and resolving their own interpersonal conflicts (Frasier, 1979)

Upward mobility of students from disadvantaged backgrounds is difficult and painful. They face emotional turmoil and traumas associated with leaving something behind as they climb the ladder of success (Gowan, 1972; Graves, 1977).

In counseling the disadvantaged gifted student, the environmental influences that affect the child should be understood. The influences of
peer, family, and school values are unique in the case of this group. The counselor/counselee relationship is crucial. Fowler (1965) states the following five questions possibly being asked by the student:

1. Does the counselor accept or reject me because of my class, race, or ethnic background?
2. Does he view me as inferior, himself as superior?
3. Is the counselor afraid to be open and real with me?
4. Does he really know me, my peers, and my home situation?
5. Can he be helpful rather than judgmental? (cited in Gowan, 1971, p. 81)

Washington (1977) has written about a strength-oriented group counseling approach that can be used with economically disadvantaged adolescents. The objective focus is: 1) helping the student to better understand the positive self, including a sense of control over his environment; and, 2) using the peer group as a support and reinforcement base. This approach has been used in various settings including an Upward Bound type program and low income day care centers.

The Differential Guidance for Gifted Model (DGG) (Safter and Bruch, 1981) was developed in an attempt to help determine individual plans for particular gifted students. It represents a proactive mental health approach that deals with problems but focuses on processes. The type of giftedness, socio-economic status, and grade or development of the child are crucial variables for determining the kind of ongoing guidance and counseling procedures for each student.

Group counseling for the disadvantaged gifted can give students an opportunity to participate in an open, caring, and trusting environment.
Beside the development of communication skills, and self-awareness, it provides an opportunity for problem-solving, decision making, and leadership skills to be used. These experiences should help in enhancing the student's self-concept through discovering that others have similar feelings and problems (Allan and Fox, 1979).

Summary Statement

While various researchers have written about discovering disadvantaged gifted children (Guilford, 1956; Meeker, 1969; Baldwin, 1975; Mercer, 1971) and educational procedures for working with them (High, 1963; Frasier, 1978; Torrance, 1965; Passow, 1963), little research has taken place in the area of counseling these students. Gowan (1968) states that attending to their affective as well as cognitive development will create a climate for achievement.

The literature suggests that disadvantaged gifted students have creative talents, that if nurtured can be used productively for the good of society (Torrance, 1964, 1968; Smith, 1965; Gowan, 1975). These students should be located at an early age in order to maximize their potential to the fullest.

The creative ability of disadvantaged gifted children has been recognized as a factor that may sustain talent against the negative effects of environment (Torrance, 1971). Its importance along with leadership ability has been cited as characteristics for use in the selection of gifted students from disadvantaged populations.

Research has found that a positive self-concept is important to creative expression (Maslow, 1968; Kris, 1952). One must have faith and
trust in himself and his abilities in order to present new and innovative ideas and solutions. Studies also show that there is a relationship between self-concept and academic achievement (Whiteman and Deutsch, 1967; Brookover and Erickson, 1969; Anastasiow, 1967). Thus enhancing the self-concept of students might well facilitate their ability to learn and achieve. A positive self-concept is pertinent to the development of disadvantaged gifted students (Colangelo and Exum, 1979). They lack confidence, have limited knowledge of their strengths and weaknesses, exhibit a desire to cling to the familiar, and are often frustrated by cultural differences and feelings of rejection.

There has been a growing recognition of leadership potential as a significant aspect of human behavior and a viable concern of giftedness. Evidence of research indicates that although disadvantaged children are interested in the future, they often have difficulty developing adequate images of it. These images of the future help determine their leadership potential. The use of creative activities involving oral communication has been advocated in teaching leadership skills (Sisk, 1977). Also recommended is the use of real and simulated situations involving leadership and followership experiences (Magoon, 1981).

Counseling disadvantaged gifted students provides a means for helping to nurture and develop their potential. A combined counseling and instructional approach focusing on personal and academic skills can give students an opportunity to participate in an open, caring, and trusting environment. It is these factors in combination with the above research findings on disadvantaged gifted and talented students that has given impetus to the present research.
CHAPTER 3

METHODOLOGY

Population and Selection of Sample

The setting for this study was the Chesapeake City Public School district located in eastern Virginia. Approximately 25,000 students representing all socio-economic levels attend school within the district.

Subjects for the study were 48 fifth and sixth grade students attending an elementary school designated as Title I according to federal guidelines specified by the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (ESEA). The students had been identified as potentially gifted and talented and selected to participate in the Chesapeake Public School's Gifted and Talented Education Program (GATE). Classification of students were as follows: 26 boys and 22 girls; 29 fifth graders and 19 sixth graders.

Research Design

The research design used was the Pretest-Posttest Control Group Design with random assignment to both experimental and control groups.

\[
\begin{align*}
R_1 & : O \times O \quad \text{High creativity} \\
R_2 & : O \times O \quad \text{Low creativity} \\
R_3 & : O \times O \quad \text{High creativity} \\
R_4 & : O \times O \quad \text{Low creativity}
\end{align*}
\]
Instrumentation

The Torrance Tests of Creative Thinking (TTCT) measures four creative thinking processes: Fluency—the total number of responses; Flexibility—the number of different categories used in responses; Originality—the number of more infrequent answers (those given by less than two percent of the population); and Elaboration—the number of details over and above what is necessary to communicate the basic idea. Interscorer reliabilities range from .86 to .99. Interform reliability ranges from .50 to .93. The majority of reliability coefficients exceed .70 (Buros, 1972). Reliability studies of the TTCT are summarized in the norms-technical manual. Construct and concurrent validity studies suggest that the test does measure behaviors consistent with the literature on creative behavior. The predictive validity of the test has not been adequately determined, but current evidence implies that the TTCT may have some predictive validity (Buros, 1974).

Because many verbal tests largely measure a student's capacity to manipulate verbal symbols, abstractions, and concepts, and these are the least stimulated in the deprived environment (Taba, 1966) use of the figural rather than the verbal form was chosen as a precaution. In addition to Torrance (1971), Solomon (1974) has cited evidence that indicates that the figural form is fair to all socio-economic classes of children. Through analysis of variance statistical techniques, Solomon did a re-analysis of her 1968 study entitled "A Comparative Analysis of Creative and Intelligent Behavior of Elementary School Children with Different Socio-Economic Backgrounds." The subjects were 722 children in
the first, third, and fifth grades of selected elementary schools in the District of Columbia. Results on separate activities of the figural Torrance Tests of Creative Thinking were provided. Disadvantaged children performed in a superior manner over advantaged children in many areas of creative thinking during the early years of school, particularly at the third grade level. There were also many areas where the disadvantaged performed as well as the advantaged in all three grades. She states that results were contrary to what might be expected on typical tests of intelligence.

The Pier-Harris Children's Self-Concept Scale (PHCSCS) was developed in 1964. It is a 15 to 20 minute self-report instrument designed for children over a wide age range. The scale was standardized on 1,183 children in grades four through twelve in a Pennsylvania school district. The internal consistency of the scale ranges from .78 to .93 and test-retest reliability from .71 to .77. Correlation with other similar instruments are in the mid-sixties.

The scale does not correlate highly with social desirability, though a correlation of -.54 to -.60 exists with a measure of anxiety which the authors feel is a true trait rather than one of response style. In research studies, recommendation for use of a control group is made as scores tend to increase slightly with retesting (Buros, 1972). The PHCSCS was selected because of the advantages it offers in use with the particular subjects chosen for this study. Designed for use with children, it has been more than adequately standardized and reliability and validity are comparable to or better than other instruments of similar
purpose. The use of the PHCSCS for research and studies of change in self-concept is encouraged and recommended (Piers, 1969; Buros, 1972).

Gain in leadership will be measured by the Scales for Rating the Behavioral Characteristics of Superior Students (SRBCSS), Part IV, Leadership Characteristics.

This scale was developed in an attempt to provide teachers with an objective and systematic way of identifying gifted students. They are intended as a supplement to be used in conjunction with other identification criteria. A series of studies conducted found a test-retest reliability range of .77 to .91. Interjudge reliability ranged from .67 to .91. The SRBCSS discriminated between forty average students (mean IQ-109) and forty gifted students (mean IQ-137) (ps .01). Its correlation with measures of creativity, intelligence, and achievement, were low but significant (Renzulli, 1971).

In this study the SRBCSS was validated by comparing teacher's ratings on it with peer ratings using a standard socio-economic technique. Students in the subject's classes were asked to rate their classmate on three hypothetical leadership situations.

Procedures

Data Collection

Students were administered the Torrance Tests of Creative Thinking, figural form A and the Piers-Harris Children's Self-Concept Scale by trained teachers. Teachers also completed the Scales for Rating the Behavioral Characteristics of Superior Students, Part IV, Leadership
Characteristics for each student and assigned them an identification number unknown to the investigator. Students were divided according to their total creativity score, the Creativity Index. The Creativity Index, an indicator of the student's creative potential is found by pooling the creative strength ratings and the average standard score. Group A consisted of those students having scores in the top 50% of all those tested and Group B consisted of students whose scores fell in the bottom 50% of all those tested. Two experimental groups and two control groups were formulated. Random selection from Group A comprised one experimental group and one control group, students with high creativity scores. Random selection from Group B comprised the second experimental and control groups, students with low creativity scores. There were twelve students in each group.

Treatment

Subjects in the two experimental groups participated in one hour structured group counseling sessions held bi-weekly for approximately six weeks. The sessions consisted primarily of a combination of structured group strategies to develop decision-making, problem-solving, and communication skills; to promote self-awareness; and to increase proficiency in supplementary academic areas such as test-taking and study skills. Time was also devoted to sharing and responding to personal feelings. The exercises and strategies were developed by the experimenter using a combination of pre-existing published materials selected and modified to meet the unique needs of the students. The control
groups continued with the regular class schedule during this time which consisted of going to and using the library.

**Statistical Methods**

Analysis of Variance with an a priori contrast was used for testing Hypothesis One and Two, to determine if treatment had an effect on the self-concept and leadership skills of the experimental group. It was also used to test Hypothesis Four and Five to determine if within the experimental group there was greater gain for the high creative students compared to the low creative students. A Pearson Product-Moment Correlation was computed to determine if there was a significant relationship between creative thinking ability, self-concept, and leadership ability among the students of all four groups.

Upon application of statistical analysis to the collected data, acceptance or rejection of the hypotheses along with a report of the findings was made.
CHAPTER 4

ANALYSIS OF DATA

The present investigation sought to determine the effects of a program of structured group counseling on the self-concept and leadership skills of disadvantaged gifted elementary students. A total of 48 fifth and sixth grade students participated in the study. The original population of 54 was reduced to 48 due to withdrawal from school or illness.

The results of the investigation are presented by hypotheses. Analysis of Variance was used to test Hypotheses One, Two, Four, and Five. A Pearson Product-Moment Correlation was computed to test Hypothesis Three. The 0.05 level of confidence was the criterion point for acceptance or rejection of the hypotheses. The Statistical Packages for the Social Sciences (SPSS) were chosen as most suitable for the experimental study. The SPSS provided easy storage of raw data as well as the means and interaction variables.

Hypothesis One

It was hypothesized that there would be a significantly higher mean gain score on self-concept for disadvantaged gifted students who participated in a program of structured group counseling compared to the control group, as measured by the Piers-Harris Children's Self-Concept Scale (PHCSCS).

Data relative to this hypothesis are presented in Table 4.1 and Table 4.2. The hypothesis was rejected. The calculated F ratio shown in Table 4.1 indicates that there were no significant differences in the mean gain scores for self-concept. Table 4.2 shows the results of an a
### Table 4.1

**Analysis of Variance**

Mean Gain Scores for Self-Concept

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>D.F.</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>Mean Squares</th>
<th>F. Ratio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>230.3959</td>
<td>76.7986</td>
<td>1.658 NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>2038.5815</td>
<td>46.3314</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>2268.9773</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4.2
Oneway Analysis of Variance
Mean Gain Score
Combined Experimental vs. Combined Control Groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Standard Error</th>
<th>T Value</th>
<th>D.F.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Self-Concept</td>
<td>-6.750</td>
<td>3.929</td>
<td>-1.718 (NS)</td>
<td>44.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership</td>
<td>-1.666</td>
<td>2.998</td>
<td>-0.556 (NS)</td>
<td>44.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
priori contrast using Oneway Analysis of Variance. The combined experimental groups are constrained with the combined control groups. The resultant $t$ statistic indicates that the $F$ value of 2.951 was not significant at the .05 level for the two combined group's differences in the means of the mean gain scores for self-concept.

These results were not in keeping with the findings of other researchers reported in Chapter 2. Experimental treatment for improved self-concept would appear to have had little effect as measured by the mean gain scores on the PHCSCS.

Hypothesis Two

It was hypothesized that there would be a significantly higher mean gain score on leadership for disadvantaged gifted students who participated in a program of structured group counseling compared to the control groups, as measured by the Scales for Rating Behavioral Characteristics of Superior Students (SRBCSS), Part IV, Leadership characteristics.

Based on relative data in Tables 4.2 and 4.3 the hypothesis was rejected. In Table 4.3 the calculated $F$ ratio of 0.537 indicates that there were no significant differences in the mean gain scores for leadership. Again the results of an a priori contrast using Oneway Analysis of Variance between the combined experimental groups and the combined control groups is shown in Table 4.2. The resultant $F$ value of 0.3090 for leadership was not significant at the .05 level.

Experimental treatment for increased leadership skills would appear to have had little effect as measured by the mean gain scores on the
Table 4.3
Analysis of Variance
Mean Gain Scores for Leadership

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>D.F.</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>Mean Squares</th>
<th>F Ratio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>43.4167</td>
<td>14.4722</td>
<td>0.537 (NS)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>1186.4989</td>
<td>26.9659</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>1229.9153</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SRBCSS, Part IV, Leadership. These findings were contradictory to research findings concerning leadership as reported in Chapter 2.

Hypothesis Three

It was hypothesized that there would be a statistically significant correlation between creative thinking test scores, self-concept test scores, and leadership test scores for disadvantaged gifted students within the experimental and control groups.

Data relative to this hypothesis are presented in Table 4.4. A Pearson Product-Moment Correlation was computed to analyze the data. Although some portions of the hypothesis were rejected, there was significant correlation in some areas.

Creativity did not appear to be related to leadership or self-concept pretests or posttests. This contradicts findings which show that many characteristics found in persons possessing leadership potential and healthy self-concepts are the same as those necessary for high creativity. (Taylor, 1964; Kris, 1952). Self-concept pretest scores correlated significantly with self-concept posttest scores (.0001) reinforcing test reliability. Self-concept pretest scores also correlated significantly with leadership pretest scores (.0358), and leadership posttest scores (.0669). Student's leadership ability appeared to have a significant relationship to their self-concepts. One could make the supposition that in order to be a competent leader, a person must possess high self-regard as a prerequisite to high regard and followership from others. Leadership pretest scores correlated highly with leadership posttest scores (.0001).
Table 4.4
Correlation Coefficients of All Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Creativity Index</th>
<th>Self-Concept Pretest</th>
<th>Self-Concept Posttest</th>
<th>Leadership Pretest</th>
<th>Leadership Posttest</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Creativity Index</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Concept Pretest</td>
<td>.05466</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Concept Posttest</td>
<td>.01723</td>
<td>.72364***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership Pretest</td>
<td>.07666</td>
<td>.30381*</td>
<td>.12132</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership Posttest</td>
<td>.09003</td>
<td>.38472**</td>
<td>.32926*</td>
<td>.54115***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Significance at p .05
**Significance at p .01
***Significance at p .001
Hypothesis Four

It was hypothesized that within the experimental group only, the high-creative students would have a significantly higher mean gain-score on self-concept than the low-creative students as measured by the Piers-Harris Children's Self-Concept Scale (PHCSCS), Part IV, Leadership.

Table 4.1 and Table 4.5 show data relative to this hypothesis. The calculated $F$ ratio shown in Table 4.1 indicates that there were no significant differences in the mean gain scores for self-concept. Table 4.5 shows the results of a contrast between high creative students and low creative students within the experimental group. The resultant $t$ statistic indicates that the $F$ value of 1.664 was not significant at the .05 level for the two group's difference in the means of the mean gain scores for self-concept.

Experimental treatment for improved self-concept as it relates to the creativity index would appear to have had little effect as measured by the mean gain scores on the PHCSCS. The hypothesis was rejected.

Hypothesis Five

It was hypothesized that within the experimental group only, the high creative students would have a significantly higher mean gain-score on leadership than the low-creative students as measured by the Scales for Rating the Behavioral Characteristics of Superior Students (SRBCSS), Part IV, Leadership.

The hypothesis was rejected based on data shown in Table 4.3 and Table 4.5. Again the calculated $F$ ratio shown in Table 4.3 indicates
Table 4.5
Mean Gain Scores within Experimental Group
High Creative Index vs. Low Creative Index

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Standard Error</th>
<th>T Value</th>
<th>D.F.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Self-Concept</td>
<td>3.5833</td>
<td>2.7788</td>
<td>1.290 (NS)</td>
<td>44.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership</td>
<td>0.0833</td>
<td>2.1200</td>
<td>-0.039 (NS)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
that there were no significant differences in the mean gain scores for leadership. The result of the a priori contrast using One-way Analysis of Variance in Table 4.5 shows the t statistic which indicates an F value of .0015. This was not significant at the .05 level for the difference in mean gain scores for the two groups.

Experimental treatment for increased leadership skills appeared to have little effect as measured by the mean gain scores on the SRBCSS, Part IV, Leadership when related to creativity.

Analysis of Mean Gain-Scores

Upon examination of the group means for mean gain scores shown in Table 6 found that in both self-concept and leadership, the low creative control group made more gain than the other groups (5.500 for self-concept, 1.333 for leadership). A possible reason may have been that one might expect greater gain in low-creative students because there was more room for gain to occur. The group mean on the self-concept pretest and the leadership pretest were lower than any other group (except for the high creative control group which had a comparable, 59.91.) Thus more gain was made in group 4 but consideration should be given to the fact that the possibility of this achievement could be attributed to a lower pretest mean initially. It should be noted that the group's posttest means were lower than the high-creative experimental group's.

The other possible explanation for greater mean gain scores among the low-creative control group may lie in the area of student perceptions. Cook and Campbell (1979) state that though randomization conveniently rules out many threats to internal validity, it does not
rule out all of them. Some of them will tend to obscure true
differences, by making no-treatment control groups perform atypically.
They state:

It is rare in our society to have valuable resources distribu-
ted on a random basis. Instead we expect them to be
distributed according to need, merit, seniority, or on a 'first
come, first served' basis. Distribution by merit or need is
more common than distribution by chance. p. 57

The control group as well as the experimental groups may have
perceived the group sessions as given to students who needed help in
those areas the most. In every case, the two control groups achieved
higher mean gain scores but not higher pretest or posttest scores.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group 1</th>
<th>Creativity Index</th>
<th>Leadership Pretest</th>
<th>Self-Concept Pretest</th>
<th>Leadership Posttest</th>
<th>Self-Concept Posttest</th>
<th>Leadership Gain-Score</th>
<th>Self-Concept Gain-Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hi Creat. Exp.</td>
<td>128.750</td>
<td>34.583</td>
<td>63.416</td>
<td>33.833</td>
<td>66.500</td>
<td>-0.750</td>
<td>3.083</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 2</td>
<td>105.500</td>
<td>32.333</td>
<td>60.750</td>
<td>31.666</td>
<td>60.250</td>
<td>-0.666</td>
<td>-0.500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lo Creat. Exp.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 3</td>
<td>126.416</td>
<td>31.500</td>
<td>62.083</td>
<td>30.416</td>
<td>65.916</td>
<td>-1.083</td>
<td>3.833</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hi Creat. Control</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 4</td>
<td>105.083</td>
<td>31.583</td>
<td>59.916</td>
<td>32.916</td>
<td>65.416</td>
<td>1.333</td>
<td>5.500</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CHAPTER 5

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This chapter summarizes the present investigation, states the findings, discusses the hypotheses and conclusions, and offers recommendations for future research.

Summary

The problem of this study was to determine the effects of a program of structured group counseling on the self-concept and leadership skills of disadvantaged gifted elementary school students. The study was conducted for the following purposes:

1. To determine if participation in a program of structured group counseling would affect the self-concept test scores and leadership test scores of disadvantaged gifted elementary students.

2. To determine if high-creative or low-creative disadvantaged gifted students would achieve a greater gain in self-concept and leadership test scores after participating in a program of structured group counseling.

3. To determine if there was a significant relationship between creative thinking ability, self-concept and leadership skills of disadvantaged gifted elementary students.

In order to facilitate this process, the following five hypotheses were tested:

Hypothesis One. There will be a significantly higher mean gain score on self-concept for disadvantaged gifted students who participate
in a program of structured group counseling compared to the control groups.

**Hypothesis Two.** There will be a significantly higher mean gain score on leadership for disadvantaged gifted students who participate in a program of structured group counseling compared to the control groups.

**Hypothesis Three.** There will be a statistically significant correlation between creative thinking test scores for disadvantaged gifted students within the experimental and control groups.

**Hypothesis Four.** Within the experimental group only, the high-creative students will have a significantly higher mean gain score on self-concept than will the low-creative students.

**Hypothesis Five.** Within the experimental group only, the high-creative students will have a significantly higher mean gain score on leadership than will the low-creative students.

The subjects for this study were 48 fifth and sixth grade students attending an elementary school in Chesapeake, Virginia designated as Title I according to federal guidelines specified by the Elementary and Secondary Act of 1965 (ESEA). The students had been identified as potentially gifted, and were selected to participate in the Chesapeake School's Gifted and Talented Education Program (GATE).

Three instruments were administered as pretests. The instrument employed to measure creative thinking ability was the **Torrance Tests of Creative Thinking**, figural form A. To ensure scorer accuracy and reliability, the test answer booklets were sent to the STS Scoring Service for the Torrance Tests where scorers have been specifically trained. The subjects' Creative Index score was used as criteria for grouping within
the experimental and control groups. The Piers-Harris Children's Self-Concept Scale was used to measure change in the self-concepts of the subjects. The Scales for Rating the Behavioral Characteristics of Superior Students, Part IV, Leadership Characteristics was employed to measure growth in leadership ability. The PHCSC and the SRBCSS, Part IV, Leadership Characteristics were also administered as posttest to measure performance change.

Subjects were divided into four groups, two experimental and two control: the students with high creativity indexes were randomly assigned to experimental and control groups. The students with low creativity indexes were also assigned to experimental and control groups.

Treatment consisted of twelve 60 minute sessions held bi-weekly for a period of six weeks. The sessions consisted primarily of a combination of structured group strategies to develop decision-making, problem-solving, and communication skills; to promote self-awareness; and increase proficiency in the areas of test-taking and study skills. A doctoral level, licensed professional counselor with a background in group counseling and in working with gifted students conducted the group experiences during the school day.

Two statistical procedures were used to test the hypotheses for this study. Analysis of Variance with an a priori contrast was used for testing Hypothesis One and Two, to determine if treatment had an effect on the self-concept and leadership skills of the experimental group. It was also used to test Hypotheses Four and Five to determine if within the experimental group there was greater gain for high-creative students when
compared to the low-creative students. A Pearson Product-Moment Correlation was used to determine if there was a significant relationship between creative thinking ability, self-concept, and leadership ability among students in all four groups. The 0.05 level of confidence was the criterion point for rejection of the hypotheses.

Statement of Findings

From the analysis of the statistical data presented in this study, the following findings were established:

1. There was not a significantly higher mean gain score on self-concept for disadvantaged gifted students who participated in a program of structured group counseling compared to the control groups as measured by the PHCSCS.

2. There was not a significantly higher mean gain score on leadership for disadvantaged gifted students who participated in a program of structured group counseling compared to the control group as measured by the SRBCSS, Part IV, Leadership Skills.

3. There was no statistically significant correlation between creative thinking test scores, self-concept test scores and leadership test scores.

4. There was a significant correlation between self-concept test scores and leadership test scores.

5. There was not a significantly higher mean gain score on self-concept for high-creative students compared to the low-creative students in the experimental groups as measured by the PHCSCS.
6. There was not a significantly higher mean gain score on leadership for the high-creative students compared to the low-creative students in the experimental groups as measured by the SRBCSS, Part IV, Leadership Characteristics.

**Conclusions**

Based on the findings of this research, the following conclusions from the study are suggested:

1. Disadvantaged gifted elementary students who participate in a program of structured group counseling do not appear to show a greater improvement in self-concept than those who do not as measured by the PHCSCS.

2. Disadvantaged gifted elementary students who participate in a program of structured group counseling do not appear to show a greater increase in leadership ability compared to those who do not as measured by the SRBCSS, Part IV, Leadership Characteristics.

3. The creative thinking ability of disadvantaged gifted elementary students, as measured by the TTCT does not appear to be related to self-concept as measured by the PHCSCS, or leadership as measured by the SRBCSS. However student's leadership ability does appear to be related to their self-concepts.

4. High-creative disadvantaged gifted students who participate in a program of structured group counseling do not appear to show a greater gain in self-concept than low-creative students who also participate in the program.
5. High-creative disadvantaged gifted students who participate in a program of structured group counseling do not appear to achieve a greater increase in leadership skills than low-creative students who also participate in the program.

Discussion

Examination of the Creativity Indexes may provide additional and useful information concerning the outcome of the present investigation. The lack of greater gains among the high-creative experimental group could be attributed to the way in which the group sessions were conducted. The sessions which were structured experiences may have had a negative effect on how much the students in this particular group benefited as opposed to what they may have gained from less structured ones. Sisk (1977) advocates the use of creative activities in leadership training. In this way the interpersonal skills that assist in the self-actualization process can be developed and maximum potential can be achieved. The same sessions may have positively affected the lower-creative students so that they internalized more of the experiences.

The self-concept and leadership percentile ranks are contrary to research concerning these areas and the disadvantaged student (Gomez, 1978; Sisk, 1975; Thompson, 1972), which found that disadvantaged students have markedly low self-esteem. The mean score for the entire group on the PHCSCS pretest was 61.5 which ranked in the 71st national percentile according to the norms manual (Piers, 1969). The mean score on the leadership pretest was 32.5. The mean score on the leadership pretest was 32.5. The manual for the SRBCSS (Renzulli, 1976) includes
results of studies conducted to determine if the scales could sufficiently discriminate between groups of children. The mean score on the leadership scale for gifted students was 29.48 and for average students, 22.33. The scores obtained for the entire group of subjects taking part in the present investigation was 32.5. Thus it would seem that evidence strongly indicates that the subjects composed an atypical group whose results could not be accurately predicted when based on typical norms.

Efforts were made to adjust for intervening and extraneous variables such as peer social status, and logistics of time. However, these factors may have had an important effect on the outcome of the experimentation. Present throughout the experiment was a factor of differences in maturity of the subjects. Fifth and sixth grade students were grouped together and in several instances it was reported that the sixth graders appeared to have more confidence in speaking and self-expression. This may have been due to the fact that they were older and in a higher grade. Many of the fifth graders appeared to be conscious of their social standing and as a result, had less verbal participation. The time of year the treatment took place may have also adversely affected the outcome of the experiment. Schools were due to close for the summer towards the end of the project and various school closing activities held during the day may have disrupted the normal routine and student behavior. In addition, the school in which the group sessions were conducted was without air conditioning. The combination of timing and heat may have contributed to short attention spans of students toward the end of treatment. The instruments chosen for the study, the Torrance Tests of
Creative Thinking, the Piers-Harris Children's Self-Concept Scale, and the Scales for Rating the Behavioral Characteristics of Superior Students, Part IV, Leadership Characteristics were three of the most widely used and accepted for use in research studies. However, there is considerable divergence on what creativity actually is (Treffinger, Renzulli, and Fieldhosen, 1971). Creativity as measured by the TTCT should be viewed as creative thinking ability defined by that instrument and not necessarily creative performance or creativity as defined by other measures of creativity.

Therefore, the hypothesis that self-concept and leadership skills are not affected by creativity should not be generalized. The results of this study only show that self-concept as measured by the PHCSCS and leadership as measured by the SRBCSS is not affected by creativity as measured by the TTCT.

Recommendations

The following recommendations for future study are based on the findings and conclusions of this study, the review of related literature, and information gained as a result of conducting this investigation:

1. Further research is needed in the field of creativity measurement for the disadvantaged gifted. The use of varied instruments measuring creativity might provide additional information concerning creative thinking ability versus actual creative performance of this specific group. It will also serve to explain creative ability as defined by other measures.
2. Further research is needed in the field of leadership measurement and training for intellectually and academically gifted students. This could generate more finite instrumentation and provide alternate choices for use. Fraiser (1979) states that developing appropriate skills for anticipating and coping with the future is a critical need of disadvantaged gifted children, for often they can quickly be consumed by attitudes of apathy or indifference when the future appears hopeless.

3. Experimental studies investigating the self-concept and leadership skills of disadvantaged gifted elementary students should be conducted on a wider scale. Previous research has concentrated primarily on the disadvantaged child or the gifted child (Colangelo and Exum, 1979; Sisk, 1975; Torrance and Allan, 1965). The combination of the two characteristics, gifted and disadvantaged, produces a unique individual about whom little is known. Possible differences existing between this group and others should be discovered.

4. Longitudinal studies of creativity, self-concept, and leadership of disadvantaged gifted students is recommended. Periodic comparisons should be made between students receiving counseling or training in these areas and those not receiving such training. One such study conducted by Torrance (1977) is still in progress.

5. There should be implementation of group guidance and instructional activities focusing on the needs of the disadvantaged gifted. This will provide them an opportunity to develop their potentials. Torrance's (1977) thesis is that the greatest strengths of disadvantaged and culturally different students are their creative skills and
motivations, and that these should be given priority consideration in developing curricula and career plans for them.

6. Those responsible for the planning of guidance and counseling programs for the disadvantaged gifted and talented student should be very cognizant of student self-concept. Programs should be planned carefully so that components are based on research and designed to meet the student's specific needs.

The limitations of the current investigation as well as the implications for future study provide a basis from which the following recommendations are made:

7. Use of only one grade level should be made to allow for differences in maturity and intellectual development of students. If this is not feasible, efforts should be made to control for grade level.

8. The time of year in which the study is to be conducted should be chosen with care. Excessive interruptions of the daily routine by various activities and student anticipation of holidays and vacations could distort the results of the study.

9. The use and development of other instruments measuring creativity, self-concept, and leadership should be made. For the purpose of this study, the variables are defined in terms of what is measured by the TTCT, PHCSCS, and the SRBCSS. Replication of this investigation using other measuring devices may provide different results due to the instrument's assessment and view of the qualities that make up creativity, self-concept, and leadership ability.
APPENDIX A
## Creativity Indexes and Raw Scores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student</th>
<th>Group 1 Experimental</th>
<th>Group 2 Experimental</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Creativity Index</td>
<td>Leadership Pretest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student</th>
<th>Group 1 Experimental</th>
<th>Group 2 Experimental</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Creativity Index</td>
<td>Leadership Pretest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Creativity Indexes and Raw Scores

### Group 3 Control

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student</th>
<th>Creativity Index</th>
<th>Leadership Pretest</th>
<th>Self-Concept Pretest</th>
<th>Leadership Posttest</th>
<th>Self-Concept Posttest</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Group 4 Control

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student</th>
<th>Creativity Index</th>
<th>Leadership Pretest</th>
<th>Self-Concept Pretest</th>
<th>Leadership Posttest</th>
<th>Self-Concept Posttest</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
GROUP SESSIONS

Discussion and Activity Focus

Session 1
1. Introduction to group purpose and process.
2. Orientation to interpersonal communication skills including active listening and feedback.

Session 2  (self-concept)
1. Personal identity, strengths and weaknesses, positive aspects of each group member.

Session 3  (Self-concept)
1. Personal decision-making through values clarification.
2. The effects of other's expectations on our personal values and ideals.

Session 4  (leadership)

Session 5  (self-concept and leadership)
1. Goal setting and time management.
2. Assessing one's progress in terms of achieving his goals.
3. How to modify goals if necessary.

Session 6  (leadership)
1. Analyzing component parts of problems.
2. Synthesizing data into a plan.

Session 7  (leadership)
1. Creative and productive thinking techniques.
   A. Brainstorming
   B. Generating and evaluating multiple ideas and solutions to problems.
Session 8  (leadership)
1. Decision making through problem-solving, deductive reasoning, and study of the future.

Session 9  (leadership)
1. Sensitivity to the needs of others.
2. Using tact and diplomacy in dealing with others.

Session 10  (study skills)
1. Note taking, basic research skills—collecting, organizing, and presentation of data.

Session 11  (test taking skills)
1. Purposes and types of tests.
2. Testing skills—classifying, patterning, analogies.
3. Practice sample tests.

Session 12  (Self-concept)
1. Group closure
   A. Statement of something positive about each group member.
   B. Sharing of feelings about group experiences by each member.
Session 1

Objectives

1. To introduce students to the group purpose and process.
2. To orientate students to interpersonal communication skills including active listening and feedback.

Materials

Cookies.

Introduction

Welcome students and introduce yourself. Break the ice by offering cookies, explaining, "We're going to be working together as a group. We ought to get acquainted." Chat for a few minutes. (Explain the reason for their being in the group: e.g., to practice leadership skills and to work on how we feel about ourselves.) Explain that their names were picked randomly (out of a hat). No grades, report to parents or teachers will be made.

Activity

Tell students that they will begin with a get acquainted game. Explain the rules:

Students should sit in a circle. Go around the circle and let each person tell their first and last names, and something they like. After this is completed choose one student to get in the middle of the circle. The student should clap hands twice and point to any student. That student has to name the four people sitting on his right. If he cannot, he has to get in the middle of the circle and repeat until someone else gets "out."

Discussion

1. What were some of the things we did while we were playing the Name Game (listened, looked or observed, repeated what was said, moved)?
2. How did you feel when you were called on?
3. Why is it important to listen and actively participate in group discussions?
   Explain that we were doing what scientists do. They observe, identify, and verbalize. They use their eyes, ears, and other senses to study things.
4. How can this be useful in our everyday lives?
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Session 2

Objective

1. To enhance student's self-esteem and ability to self-disclose by increasing awareness of their strengths and weaknesses.

Materials


Activity 1

Have students choose their favorite animal or an animal they would most like to be. Have students write the name of the animal down and three positive qualities or characteristics of the animal. Go around the circle and ask students to share with the group. The student should choose one of those characteristics and apply it to himself. Example: "A dog is friendly, kind, and happy. I am happy." Students should do the same exercise in reverse, using negative characteristics. Example: "A dog is noisy, mean, stubborn. I am noisy." Each student should have a chance to do this.

Discussion

1. Is it important to know what you can do well and what you cannot? Why?
2. Do you have to be good at everything you do?
3. What are ways others can make us feel good about ourselves?
4. What are ways you can make you feel good about yourself?
5. Is there a difference between emphasizing your strengths and bragging?

Activity II

Focus on the fact that all people have strengths and weaknesses. Even the smartest students have weaknesses and the most unpopular people have strengths.

Tell students that they are going to learn more about themselves by completing the "Accentuate the Positive" worksheet. If time permits, let students read their "Fringe Benefits" paragraphs. Only allow those that want to.
Session 3

Objective

1. To help the student understand that actions are caused by choice.
2. To help the student become aware of the choices they are faced with each day and the decisions they have to and can make.

Materials

Activity sheets "Promises, Promises" and "Split Decisions."

Activity

1. Have students sit in a circle. Tell them that today they are going to learn about choosing and deciding. Tell students to think of something they like to do better than anything else. Ask, "Who makes you do your favorite activity?" The most common answer will probably be "no one." Tell the students that what they actually did was to choose (pick, decide, select). Ask students to tell other things they choose or decide to do during the day.

2. Put this on the blackboard and discuss:

```
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Decision</th>
<th>Path</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alternative</td>
<td>Lake</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- - v - Outcome</td>
<td>- - v - Woods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative</td>
<td>Hunger (outcome)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- - t -</td>
<td>- - t -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>skip it</td>
<td>eat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- - v - Full Feeling (outcome)</td>
<td>- - v -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative</td>
<td>Alternative</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
```
3. Also write on the blackboard: Discuss

Three steps in making a decision:
A. what the decision is
B. what are the choices or alternatives
C. what are the outcomes or consequences

Activity

4. Have students read the activity sheet, "Promises, Promises" silently. Discuss the consequence of each action.

Activity

5. Have students complete the activity sheet, "Split Decision." Tell them to think of the decision, alternatives, and consequences in answering. After they have completed, let students share and discuss their choices.
Objective

To expand the learner's capacity to look at choices, alternatives, and make decisions through risk-taking, challenge, and use of imagination.

Materials

"Lost in the Wild" and "NASA Space Game" Activity sheets.

Activity I

1. Review the decision-making process learned in the last session. Discuss the idea that sometimes it helps to talk with others about choices.

2. Play "Lost in the Wild" game. Read each exercise aloud to students. Students who choose A should go to one side of the room while students who choose B should go to the other side. As you read each exercise let students who choose the same answer stand together. Do ask students their reasons for making certain choices. Proceed through the exercise until the end. Have students add up the number of days as they go. If over 10 were taken, some wrong decisions were made.

Discussion Questions

Did you make the decisions by yourself?
Did you discuss any with the pilot?
How did you feel about making a life and death decision?

Activity II

1. Pass out the NASA game to each student. Tell the students to read the directions silently while you read them aloud. They should then complete the answer sheet on their own (5 minutes).

When they have completed this, divide them into teams of five and do their answers as a group. There must be a majority agreement before an item can be ranked (10 minutes). A person from the group should tell how they ranked the items and why.

Discussion Questions

Did you score as well when you made decisions by yourself as when you were working with others?
What did you do when you and another person could not agree on an answer?
Does it sometimes help to talk over possible choices with other people? When might it help? When might it not help? With whom does a final decision or choice always rest? When do you think the best decisions are made?
Session 5

Objectives

1. To help students become aware of well-known leaders to society and their contributions.
2. To provide an opportunity for students to become aware or think about desirable leadership qualities.
3. To help students assess their leadership style and potential.

Materials

Leadership Packet

Activity

1. Ask students if they can tell you what a leader is? Ask: Who can tell me what a leader is? Can you think of some people that lead you in your everyday life (parents, teachers, President of the United States, ministers, etc)? Do they lead in different ways? What do they have in common? How would you define a "good" leader?

2. Say to the students: All of us are followers sometimes, and other times we are leaders. Think of time when you have been a follower or a leader. Do you remember a time when you wished you had not followed? A time when you were glad you were the leader? A time when no one would lead?

3. Pass out the Leadership Packets. Let students complete the first two pages. Have them draw or write in the name of three other people in the empty spaces.

4. Discuss the situations on pages 3 and 4. Let students share their responses and give reasons for making them. Discuss appropriate responses.

5. Have students complete pages 4 and 5 of the packet. This is only to promote self-awareness and need not be shared with the group.

6. Tell students that people have different leadership styles. Ask them to think about their leadership style. Do you like to make all the decisions? Do you listen to other suggestions? Do you let the group decide on what to do?
Session 6

Objectives

1. To help students develop awareness and sensitivity to the needs of others.
2. To assist students in learning to use tact and diplomacy in dealing with others.

Materials

Activity sheet "Sensible Solutions" and copy of "Take Me Out to the Old Ball Game" story.

Activity

1. Ask students if they have ever been in a situation where two or more people have a disagreement? Do you think it is possible for it to be solved so that everyone is happy? If you have to be the one to solve it, what things should you think about before making any decisions? Should you be loyal to a friend even if it means being dishonest? Who or why not? Should you make a bad decision to keep from hurting someone's feelings? Do you think there is a way you can tell a person something bad so that it will not hurt his feelings as much or make him as angry? Tell students that many times in dealing with others it is important to keep things going smoothly and keep down conflict. Many jobs or positions require this skill. Can you think of some? Examples: Doctor (giving his patient bad news), president of a club, policeman, a person who is with two friends having an argument.

One should consider the best interests as well as feelings and emotions of all involved when making a decision affecting others.

2. Read aloud to students each situation on the "Sensible Solutions" sheet. Let students discuss what they would advise their friends to do. Tell how this advice will affect their friends' feelings.

3. Read "Take Me Out to the Old Ball Game." Afterwards read Miss Ramirez's options. Write on the board:

- Send Bill and Chuck home
- Ban kickball and dodgeball
- Ban kickball and not dodgeball
- Spank Bill and Chuck
- Keep the whole class inside tomorrow
- Keep Bill and Chuck inside for a week
- Ask Bill and Chuck to promise not to fight.

Try to get students to rank order these options from the best to the worst and tell why.
Objective

To assist the student in becoming aware of the importance of goal setting, time management, and assessment of progress in terms of goal achievement.

Materials

Two activity sheets, "Taking Action."

Activity

1. Put the word "GOAL" on the blackboard. Ask students if they know what a goal is? Explain to students that a goal is anything one words to achieve. Ask what are some of the goals we set (good grades, to learn to play a sport, to complete high school, to own a car, etc.)? Managing time correctly is important in achieving our goals. It is usually best to have a plan of action? Why?

2. Tell students to answer these questions to themselves while you ask them aloud:
   1. Are you basically organized or dis-organized?
   2. Do you procrastinate or put-off doing things?
   3. Do you do only what is expected or do you strive to go beyond?
   4. Are you a perfectionist?
   5. When are you most productive (do your best work)?

3. Tell students that the first step in working toward one's goal is to set up a plan. Even short term goals such as writing a paper or long terms ones such as preparing for your future career should have a plan. It is also important that goals be realistic. That it is possible to achieve it.

4. Put on blackboard: 1) Important and Urgent
   2) Important
   3) Least Important

   What color socks to wear
   Completing homework
   Saving allowance to buy a mother's day gift
   Graduating from high school.

Tell students that all actions should be put into one of these three categories. Ask the group to rank order these goals from least important to most important.
5. Ask students to complete the "Taking Action" activity sheets. They should write the steps they plan to take to achieve their goals. For activity sheet 2, they should work out an alternate plan. Ask: "Should a goal ever be changed or modified? When? How can you tell if you are making progress toward your goal (write a plan of action and go back and check it periodically)? If time permits, students may want to share their "Taking Action" goals and plans."
Session 8

Objectives

1. To help students become aware of the rapid pace of change and how this change may affect our future.
2. To assist the student in thinking of ways in which they might contribute to society in the future.

Materials

Paper and pencil.

Activity

1. Ask students what the word "future" means. Explain that everyone has a future and that some of them will probably be future leaders in one respect or another. Two hundred years ago no one thought that we would have televisions, computers, or space exploration. What are some other ways that things are different than they were then?

2. Ask students to write how they see society, the world, and themselves twenty or thirty years from now. Include any problems that might exist and what you would do to solve them if you had the power.

3. Let students read their papers to the group.
Session 9

Objective

To introduce the concept of learning patterns and help the student clarify his own individual learning style.

Materials

Activity sheets, "How Do I Learn?" and "Homework Checklist."

Activity I

1. Tell students that today they are going to find out more about how they learn best. Stress that no one learning style is better than another. We each learn differently. We each have our areas of strength.

2. Have students complete the "How Do I Learn?" questionnaire. After they have finished let each student tell in a few sentences what they believe their learning style is.

Discussion

1. How can being aware of your individual learning pattern help you?

2. What are some other questions that may be added to the list? (Students can brainstorm other questions that may be important for how we learn.)

Activity II

Pass out the "Homework Checklist." Have students complete each question as you read it. It is not necessary to go over answers orally.
Session 10

Objective

1. To assist students in recognizing that school assignments can be done more efficiently and effectively when study skills are applied.
2. To help students develop an organized approach to studying.
3. To help students recognize, understand and practice study skills related to independent projects.
4. To help students determine which skills they need to develop.

Materials

Filmstrips, "Let's Learn to Study," filmstrip projector, cassette tape player.

Activity

1. Try to get students to talk or think about specific problems they have with schoolwork. Ask a few questions. What are the most difficult aspects of schoolwork for you? Scheduling and organizing your time? Getting the most out of class? Figuring how to get started on a project? Knowing exactly what to study? Taking good notes?

2. Tell students that developing study skills can help do schoolwork more efficiently and effectively. The filmstrips and discussions should help them develop an organized approach to studying.

3. Show "Let's Learn to Study" filmstrips part I and II. Have students complete activity frames as a discussion.
Session 11

Objective

1. To acquaint students with the purposes and types of tests.
2. To familiarize students with the testing skills of classifying, patterning, and analogies.

Materials

Activity sheets, "Helpful Hints in Test-Taking" and "Classification, Analogies, Patterns."

Activity

1. Explain to students that we will come in contact with tests everywhere we go in life. Ask students to name some reasons people take tests other than in school. Examples: Armed forces, jobs (policemen, teachers, doctors, etc.), Olympic teams, movie stars (screen tests). Tests are usually given to measure something.

2. Ask students to brainstorm helpful hints for learning how to take a test. After they have completed this, pass out activity sheet, "Helpful Hints for Test Taking," and discuss.

3. Tell students that many standardized tests measure certain types of verbal skills such as classifying, working patterns, and analogies. Explain: Classification organizes and brings order to things by putting them into groups. The items are usually alike in some way. Write on board:
   - Pen, pencil, crayon, magic marker (tools for writing)
   - Anger, happiness, joy, sadness (feelings or emotions)

   Explain: An analogy is a relationship or similarity existing between two word meanings that may or may not ordinarily be thought of. There are four basic types. Write on board:
   - Whole-part: elephant/trunk—boy/arm
   - Place: glove/hand—shoe/foot
   - Opposite: yes/no—black/white
   - Purpose: teeth/chew—ear/hear

   Explain: A pattern is an interrelatedness between objects, letters, and/or numbers in a series. Write on board:
   - 2, 4, 6, 8, ______
   - 1A, 3B, 5C, 7D, ______

4. Have students complete activity sheet, "Classification, Analogies, Patterns." Go over answers if time permits.
Session 12

Objectives

1. To help students in applying what they have learned to their everyday life experiences.
2. To bring closure to the group experience.

Materials

Paper, pencil.

Activity

Have students write "Group Reflection" at the top of the paper. Students should complete the following sentences: Write on board:

1. I learned that ________________________________.
2. I felt good when ________________________________.
3. I had fun when ________________________________.
4. Something I plan to do as a result of this group experience ______.
5. Something I would like to say to the leader ____________.

Go around and have each student read one statement they choose (only one). Collect papers.

Tell students how much you have enjoyed working with them and that you have learned many things from them.
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Abstract

THE EFFECTS OF A PROGRAM OF STRUCTURED GROUP COUNSELING ON THE SELF-CONCEPT AND LEADERSHIP SKILLS OF DISADVANTAGED GIFTED ELEMENTARY SCHOOL students

Shelia Gibbs Hill, Ed.D.

The College of William and Mary in Virginia, December 1982

Chairman: Dr. Kevin E. Geoffroy

The purpose of this study was to determine the effects of participation in structured group counseling on the self-concept and leadership skills of disadvantaged gifted elementary school children.

Subjects were forty-eight elementary students from the Chesapeake Public School District in Chesapeake, Virginia. All students had been identified as potentially gifted and talented and were in attendance at a school designated as Title I by the Elementary and Secondary Act of 1965 (ESEA).

Three instruments were used to carry out the study: The Torrance Tests of Creative Thinking (TTCT), figural form, to measure creative thinking ability; the Piers-Harris Children's Self-Concept Scale (PHCSCS) to measure change in self-concept; and the Scales for Rating the Behavioral Characteristics of Superior Students (SRBCSS), Part IV, Leadership Characteristics to measure change in leadership.

The research design used for the investigation was the Pretest-Posttest Control Group Design. Analysis of Variance using an a priori contrast was employed to determine significance of treatment. A Pearson Product-Moment Correlation was used to investigate the relationship between creative thinking ability, self-concept, and leadership skills. All hypotheses were tested at the .05 level of confidence.

The findings indicated that: (1) participation in a program of structured group counseling did not significantly increase self-concept or leadership test scores of disadvantaged gifted students and (2) among the program participants, high creative students did not have significantly higher mean gain scores in self-concept and leadership than low creative students. It was also found that (3) although there was no significant correlation between creative thinking test scores, self-concept test scores, and leadership test scores, there was significant correlation between self-concept test scores and leadership test scores.

Because research is limited, further study investigating the self-concept, leadership, and creative thinking ability of disadvantaged gifted students is needed in order to generate a broader base of knowledge and more finite instrumentation. In addition, group guidance and instructional activities focusing on the needs of the disadvantaged gifted should be implemented so as to provide opportunities for development of potential.
Vita

Sheila Gibbs Hill

Birthdate: January 4, 1949
Birthplace: Greensboro, North Carolina

Education:

1982 The College of William and Mary in Virginia
   Williamsburg, Virginia
   Certificate of Advanced Graduate Study, Counseling
   Doctor of Education, Counseling

1976 University of South Carolina
   Columbia, South Carolina
   Advanced graduate Study

1975 Old Dominion University
   Norfolk, Virginia
   Master of Science, Guidance and Counseling

1970 Bennett College
   Greensboro, North Carolina
   Bachelor of Arts, Elementary Education

Professional Experience:

1981-present Instructional Specialist/Counselor
   Gifted and Talented Program
   Chesapeake Public Schools
   Chesapeake, Virginia

1975-1980 Guidance Counselor
   Crestwood Junior High School
   Chesapeake, Virginia

1971-1975 Elementary Teacher
   Western Branch Elementary School
   Chesapeake, Virginia

1970-1971 Elementary Teacher
   Sternberger Elementary School
   Greensboro, North Carolina