



THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN GIFTED AND UNGIFTED STUDENTS' SELF-PERCEPTIONS AND THEIR PARENTS' PARENTING STYLES: A STRUCTURAL EQUATION MODEL

Bilge Bakır Ayğar¹, Mehmet Gündoğdu

Educational Sciences Guidance and Psychological Counseling Department,
Faculty of Education, Mersin University, Turkey

Abstract:

The aim of this study is to reveal the influence of parental child rearing methods on self-perceptions of gifted and ungifted students with structural equation modeling. To achieve this purpose, the study has been carried out in BİLSEM in Mersin city and in multiple elementary state schools. As a descriptive method, causal-comparative method has been used in this study. Accordingly, Demographic Information Questionnaire, Offer Self-image Questionnaire, Parenting Style Inventory have been applied to students. In statistical analysis, Mann Whitney U Test, The Kruskal Wallis H Tests, Chi-Square Test and Path Analysis Techniques have been used. As a result of the study, it is found out that self-perceptions of gifted students are higher than self-perceptions of ungifted students. In SEM (Structural Equation Modeling), parental child rearing methods related to gifted and ungifted students explain the students' self-perceptions at a statistically significant level.

Keywords: intelligence, gifted, child rearing methods, self-perception, structural equation

1. Problem Situation

Intelligence is one of important topics which is discussed in detail in area of psychology. Although so many studies have been conducted on the concept of intelligence since 19th Century, a certain specific, unanimously agreed upon definition of intelligence has not been determined yet. Therefore, there are lots of different

¹ Correspondence: email bilgebakir23@gmail.com

definitions for intelligence. Gardner (1993) define intelligence as the capacity of an individual to create a valuable product in one or more cultures and the ability to find out new problems to be solved. Wechsler (1981), on the other hand, define intelligence as a general capacity of an individual in terms of displaying purpose-oriented actions as a whole, logical thinking and affecting his/her environment (as cited in Özgüven, 2011). As there is not a common definition for the concept of intelligence, there emerges no certain definitions for concepts of high intelligence and giftedness. Definition of 'giftedness' in Marland Report (1972) has been accepted as a source by many countries and has provided different viewpoints about gifted people. According to this definition, *"A gifted child is a child who is detected by individuals who are regarded as professionals in this area that he/she is be able to carry out a high level task thanks to his/her outstanding abilities"* (Marland, 1972).

Self-perception concept which is one of the components of personality, like intelligence, is defined as the way in which an individual observes and perceives oneself and it is discussed in a developmental process. Cüceloğlu (2000) states that self-perception concept as a component of personality is the features others reflect on him, observations about the self and a collection of all characteristics which distinguish an individual from others in accordance with information he/she gets from environment. In another definition, self-perception is a total concept consisting of experiences of an individual throughout the life, environmental factors, factors affecting personality and resulting in positive and negative attitudes toward oneself (Demoulin, 1999). This concept which is stated together with self-respect and self-esteem terms can be considered as a concept described together with a feeling of self-worth and self-acceptance or a larger concept that includes these concepts (Kuzgun, 2000). Self-concept contains physical and psychological features. Physical self that is related to an individual's physical appearance emerges before spiritual self. After then, spiritual self emerges, which is constructed with the opinions, feelings and perceptions. As an individual grows, both images about 'self' come together and the person perceives the self as a whole (Bee, 1981; cited in Uyanık, 2007). When the concept of 'self' is analyzed in gifted children, their difference from ungifted children appears as "remarkable". Some researchers assert that self-respect of gifted and talented children grows earlier (Karagöllü, 1995). This situation stimulates them to be aware of their difference from other children.

Parenting style and self-representations have a lifelong connection with parent-child relationship and they have effects on child's self-perception (Kağıtçıbaşı, 2012). In accordance with these effects, it is considered that there is a relationship between parenting styles and children's self-perceptions. It is supposed that parenting styles

adopted by parents affect children's self-perceptions. There are a lot of classifications related to parenting styles; however, Maccoby and Martin's four parenting typologies with two dimensions (1983) are commonly accepted as a proper classification among them (Gracia and Garcia, 2009).

- Authoritative parenting;
- Democratic Parenting;
- Permissive/ Indulgent Parenting;
- Permissive/ Neglectful Parenting.

When this classification is analyzed, it is seen that on one hand, authoritarian parents display demanding and controlling behaviors upon their children; on the other hand, they behave in a rejecting, neglecting and indifferent way.

Democratic parents display high level behaviors in both dimensions; they are both demanding & controlling and sensitive & permissive (Gracia and Garcia, 2009). Permissive/Indulgent parents have sensitiveness/acceptance, interest at a high level and they have control/demands at a low level. On the other hand, permissive/indulgent parents display low level features in both dimensions.

Self-improvement and formation of self-perception in children begin in family environment. Family environment is the most important place for self-improvement of children. This study aims to show the effect of parenting styles of gifted and ungifted students' parents on students' self-perceptions. Moreover, this study focuses on identifying at which level students' self-perceptions differentiate depending on giftedness and gender; and at which level parenting styles differentiate depending on various variables (education level, giftedness of their children).

1. Do the parenting styles of gifted and ungifted students' parents affect students' self-perceptions?
2. Do the parenting styles differentiate depending on giftedness of students?
3. Do the self-perceptions of students differentiate depending on being gifted or ungifted?

2. Method

2.1 Research Model

The purpose of science is to identify, examine and estimate (Greenberg, 1986). Descriptive methods, on the other hand, play an important role in describing features of a specific phenomenon (Heppner, Wampold and Kivlighan, 2013). In this study, a descriptive method, casual-comparative method has been used. In this method, it is attempted to examine whether there is a difference between two or more groups and

whether there is a relationship between variables. Causal approach is an effective method in achieving research aims related to describing and estimating (Christensen, Johnson and Turner, 2015; Balcı, 2011). Structural Equation Modelling (SEM) commonly used in recent years is especially used in evaluation of relationship between variables, in improvement and testing of the theoretical models (Çelik and Yılmaz, 2013). In the study, it is attempted to test a model with SEM in which parenting styles displayed by gifted and ungifted students' parents affect self-perceptions of students.

2.2 Population Sample

Population in this study consists of students studying in elementary state schools and in BİLSEM (which works under the administration of Mersin National Education Directorate) in 2014-2015 education year. Study sample consists of 415 students at total and subgroups include 5th and 6th grade students studying part time in BİLSEM and students studying in Aliye Pozcu Elementary School, Mezitli Belediyesi Elementary School, Çankaya Elementary School, Namık Kemal Elementary School. Students have been chosen with random sampling by selecting two classes from each branch in schools. There are 223 male (53,7) and 192 female students (%46,3) in the study. 122 students have been identified to be gifted (%29,4); however, 293 students have not been identified with any diagnosis (%70,6). 203 students are studying in 5th grade (%48,9), and 212 students are studying in 6th grade (%51,1).

Table 1: Findings related to demographic information of the students

Variable		N	%
Gender	Female	192	46,3
	Male	223	53,7
Giftedness	Gifted	122	29,4
	Ungifted	293	70,6
Class	5 th grade	203	48,9
	6 th grade	212	51,1

2.3 Data Collection Tools

In this research, data collection tools are Offer Self Image Questionnaire (short form), Parenting Styles Inventory and Demographic Information Questionnaire that has been developed by the researcher.

A. Offer Self Image Questionnaire (short form): This scale developed by Offer, Ostrov, Howard and Atkinson (1989) and adapted into Turkish by Şahin (1993) consists of 99 questions and 11 sub-scales. In the adaptation process, it is stated that the scale consists of ten sub-scales; however, there is found no internal consistency for one sub-scale

(personal values). Similarly, high scores in Offer Self Image Questionnaire mean an increase in self-image in a negative way (Savaşır and Şahin, 1997). When the relationship between short and long forms of Offer Self-Image Questionnaire (OSIQ) is reviewed, reliability coefficient of OSIQ-50 is found as .90. Total score correlation between two forms of the scale (99 items and 50 items) has been found as $r = .94$. the reliability coefficient measured by test-retest method has been found as 0.74 for elementary school students and 0.83 for high school students (Savaşır and Şahin 1997).

B. Parenting Styles Inventory: It was developed by Sümer and Güngör (1999) taking Steinberg and his friends' study (1991) as example, based on dimensions and classification methods supposed by Maccoby and Martin (1983). The scale consists of two dimensions as acceptance/involvement and tight discipline/control. While the scale included 30 items when it was first developed, it decreased to 22 items in the following form (Sümer, 2000). There are 11 items in the dimension of 'acceptance/involvement' and 11 items in the dimension of 'tight discipline/control'. Even numbers in the scale represent the dimension of acceptance/involvement, odd numbers represent the dimension of tight discipline/control; also 11th, 13th and 21st items are graded reversely. Items in the scale are graded with five point Likert scale as "absolutely not right" (1 point), "not right"(2 points), "partially right"(3 points), "right"(4 points), and "very right"(5 points).

Four basic parenting styles emerge as a result of intersection of the sub-dimensions of acceptance/ involvement and tight discipline/control. These parenting styles are "explanatory/authoritative style" in which acceptance/involvement and tight discipline/control dimensions are at high level; "permissive/indulgent style" in which acceptance/involvement dimension is high but tight discipline/control is at low level; "authoritative style" in which acceptance/involvement is low but high discipline/control is at high level and "permissive/neglectful style" in which acceptance/involvement and tight discipline/control dimensions are at low level. Parenting Styles Inventory scale (PSI) has been respectively filled for mothers and fathers. According to the study of Sümer (1999), alpha reliability coefficients of both dimensions show up that acceptance/involvement dimension perceived from both parents is found as .94, tight discipline/control dimension perceived from the mother is found as .80, tight discipline/control dimension perceived from the father is found as .70 (Sümer, 1999).

2.4 Implementation and Analysis of Data

Necessary permissions have been asked from Mersin National Education Directorate for questionnaires and scales applied within the study and data collection tools have been applied to the students approximately for an hour.

LISREL packet program and SPSS 20.0 packet program have been used in statistical analysis of the data. In order to see distributions related to self-perceptions of gifted and ungifted students and their parents' parenting styles, the following measures have been used: central tendency, deviation from mean and deviation from normality. Independent sample t-test has been used to reveal whether self-perceptions of the students differ depending on gender, class and giftedness. SEM, Path Analysis has been conducted in order to identify theoretical relationship between self-perceptions of the students and parenting styles- a theoretically accepted relationship-. Independent theoretical model related to the relationship between self-perceptions of the students and their parents' parenting styles has been tested in this stage.

3. Findings

Path Analysis has been conducted for the sub-problem "Are the self-perceptions of the students affected by parenting styles?". The results are given in Figure 1 and Figure 2.



Figure 1



Figure 2

$\chi^2=12497,78$ $sd=4274$ $p=0,00000$ $RMSEA=0,068$

$\chi^2=12497,78$ $sd=4274$ $p=0,00000$ $RMSEA=0,068$

Standardized values related to the model are given in Figure 1. As seen in Figure 2, it appears that $\chi^2=12497,78$ and $sd=4274$. When these values are proportioned to each

other, χ^2/sd has been found as 2,92. When the model is evaluated by considering χ^2/sd ($\chi^2/sd = 12497,78/4274=2,92$), it can be stated that fit is perfect according to this result. For this model, RMSEA value is found as 0,068 and the other fit values emerge as NFI=0,81, NNFI=0,88, RMR=0,18, CFI=0,88, GFI=0,61 and AGFI=0,59. When path analysis in table is analyzed in terms of structural model, it can be expressed that path coefficients at moderate level are obtained for parenting styles in explanation of self-perception. In the model, it is seen that parenting styles of both mothers and fathers explain self-perception. In other words, it is possible to interpret that parenting styles adopted by their parents predict students' self-perceptions in a negative way. While parenting styles of mothers explain students' self-perceptions at -0,24 level, parenting styles of fathers explain students' self-perceptions at -0,35 level. As a result of analysis, t values are found significant in measurement model and structural model and it appears that $\chi^2=12497,78$ and $sd=4274$. When these values are proportioned to each other, χ^2/sd ratio has been found as 2,92. When the model is evaluated considering χ^2/sd ($\chi^2/sd = 12497,78/4274=2,92$), it can be expressed that fit is perfect according to this result. Model, χ^2/sd ($\chi^2/sd = 12497,78/4274=2,92$). When t-values are analyzed for this model, it is seen that t-values are significant at 0,01 level because parameter values exceed 2,56. It is possible to acknowledge that the model which is built in accordance with theoretical structure and fit indices has been confirmed.

After this model is tested, Kruskal Wallis H test has been applied in order to identify whether there is a differentiation between self-perceptions and four styles which have been obtained by crossing sub-dimensions of parenting styles inventory scale. The findings related to self-perceptions of gifted & ungifted students and their parents' parenting styles are given in Table 1 and Table 2.

Table 2: Kruskal Wallis H Test Findings Related to Gifted and Ungifted Students' Self-Perceptions and Their Mothers' Parenting Styles

	Group	N	Mean Ranks	Sd	χ^2	p
Gifted Students	Permissive/Neglectful	19	86,03	3	31,247	0,000
	Permissive/Indulgent	61	45,03			
	Authoritative	24	82,38			
	Explanatory/Authoritative	17	60,15			
	Group	N	Mean Ranks	Sd	χ^2	p
Ungifted Students	Permissive/Neglectful	40	160,53	3	32,657	0,000
	Permissive/Indulgent	73	113,18			
	Authoritative	80	185,60			
	Explanatory/Authoritative	98	132,19			

When Table 2 is examined, it is seen that there is a significant differentiation in self-perception total scores of gifted students depending on their mothers' parenting styles $\{\chi^2 (sd=3, N=121)=31,247, p<0,05\}$. According to this finding, it can be considered that parenting styles of mothers affect students' self-perceptions. When mean ranks of groups are examined, it is seen that children of permissive/neglectful mothers have the lowest self-perception and it is followed by children whose mothers adopt authoritative style. It is possible to express that the highest self-perceptions belong to children whose mothers adopt permissive/indulgent style. Annelerin çocuk yetiştirme stillerine göre üstün zekalı olmayan öğrencilerin de benlik algıları toplam puanlarında anlamlı bir farklılaşma görülmektedir $\{\chi^2 (sd=3, N=291)=32,657, p<0,05\}$. Also, it appears that there is a significant differentiation in self-perception total scores of ungifted students depending on their mothers' parenting styles $\{\chi^2 (sd=3, N=291)=32,657, p<0,05\}$. According to this finding, it is possible to express that mothers' parenting styles affect children's self-perceptions. When mean ranks of groups are examined, it is seen that the lowest self-perceptions belong to children whose mothers adopt authoritative styles and it is followed by children who have permissive/neglectful mothers; on the other hand, the highest self-perceptions belong to children whose mothers adopt permissive/indulgent style.

Table 3: Kruskal Wallis H Test Findings Related to Self-Perceptions of Gifted and Ungifted Students and Parenting Styles of Their Fathers

	Group	N	Mean Rank	Sd	χ^2	p
Gifted Students	Permissive/Neglectful	25	79,98	3	30,609	0,000
	Permissive/Indulgent	56	45,29			
	Authoritative	20	87,50			
	Explanatory/Authoritative	20	54,75			
	Group	N	Mean Rank	Sd	χ^2	p
Ungifted Students	Permissive/Neglectful	49	157,65	3	47,377	0,000
	Permissive/Indulgent	68	103,16			
	Authoritative	71	197,38			
	Explanatory/Authoritative	103	133,32			

When Table 3 is examined, it is seen that there is a significant differentiation in self-perception total scores of gifted students depending on parenting styles of their fathers $\{\chi^2 (sd=3, N=121)=30,609, p<0,05\}$. According to this finding, it can be expressed that parenting styles of fathers affect students' self-perceptions. When mean ranks of groups are analyzed, it appears that the lowest self-perceptions belong to children whose fathers adopt authoritative style and it is followed by children who have

permissive/neglectful fathers; on the other hand, the highest self-perceptions belong to children whose fathers adopt permissive/indulgent parenting style. There is a statistically significant differentiation in self-perception total scores of ungifted students depending on parenting styles of their fathers $\{\chi^2 (sd=3, N=291)=47,377, p<0,05\}$. According to this finding, it is possible to think that parenting styles of fathers affect students' self-perceptions. When mean ranks of groups are analyzed, it is seen that the lowest self-perception belong to children whose fathers adopt authoritative parenting style and it is followed by children who have permissive/neglectful fathers; on the other hand, the highest self-perceptions belong to children whose father adopt permissive/indulgent parenting styles.

Descriptive statistical results related to self-perceptions of gifted and ungifted students are given in Table 4.

Table 4: Descriptive Statistical Results Related to Self-perceptions of Gifted and Ungifted students

Self-perception	\bar{X}	S	Kurtosis	Skewness	Min-Max	Xmod
Family relations	22,2193	8,78446	1,045	,725	12,00-55,00	12
Impulse Control	20,2217	8,06070	,658	-,052	8,00-48,00	13
Sexual Attitudes	4,6392	2,43819	,740	,006	2,00-12,00	2
Coping Strength	4,9446	2,90332	,714	-,463	2,00-12,00	2
Body Image	9,7229	5,04883	,741	-,174	4,00-24,00	4
Emotional level	20,2217	8,06070	,658	-,052	8,00-48,00	13
Adaptation to Environment	5,0843	2,78975	,697	-,250	2,00-12,00	2
Occupational and Educational Goals	1,8120	1,39299	1,702	1,818	1,00-6,00	1
Social Relations	15,7614	6,59149	,858	,400	7,00-40,00	12
Mental Health	22,3333	8,42629	,379	-,435	8,00-48,00	18
Total	116,5049	38,46593	,585	-,204	51,00-240,00	92

Table 4 shows the means related to self-perception total scores and sub-scale scores, minimum and maximum scores, kurtosis and skewness coefficients and standard deviations. It is seen that the lowest total score in scale is 51 and the highest score is 240. The lowest score obtained in family relations sub-scale is 12 and the highest score is 55. The lowest score in impulse control sub-scale is 8 and the highest score is 48. The lowest score in sexual attitudes sub-scale, adaptation to environment sub-scale and coping strength sub-scale is 2 and the highest score in these sub-scales is 12. The lowest score in body image sub-scale is 4 and the highest score is 24. The lowest score in the emotional level sub-scale is 8 and the highest score is 48. The lowest score in occupation and education aims sub-scale is 1 and the highest score is 6. The lowest score in social relations sub-scale is 7 and the highest score is 40. The lowest score in 'mental health' sub-scale is 8 and the highest score is 48. Lastly, when it comes to total scores obtained in Offer Self Image Questionnaire, the lowest score appeared as 51 and the highest score as 240.

Kolmogorov-Smirnov test has been conducted in order to identify whether self-perception and its sub-scales have a normal distribution or not. According to normality test results, it appeared that total scores related to the variable of students' self-perceptions do not have a normal distribution ($p < 0,05$). When the sub-scales are examined, it has been identified that they also do not have a normal distribution ($p < 0,05$). In this case, Mann Whitney U test has been conducted in order to identify whether there is a statistically significant differentiation between self-perceptions of gifted and ungifted students.

For the sub-problem "*Do the self-perceptions of the students differ depending on being gifted or ungifted?*", Table-5 displays the results of Mann Whitney U test which has been conducted in order to identify whether there is a significant differentiation in self-perceptions of students depending on being gifted or ungifted.

Table 5: Mann Whitney U Test Results Related to Self-Perceptions of Gifted and Ungifted Students

Variable	Group	N	Mean Ranks	Rank Sum	U	z	p																																																																																																																				
Family Relations	Gifted Students	122	188,34	22978,00	15475,000	-2,157	,031																																																																																																																				
	Ungifted Students	293	216,18	63342,00				Impulse Control	Gifted Students	122	174,29	21263,50	13760,500	-3,698	,000	Ungifted Students	293	222,04	65056,50	Sexual Attitudes	Gifted Students	122	217,26	26289,00	16424,000	-1,146	,252	Ungifted Students	293	202,75	59202,00	Coping Strength	Gifted Students	122	181,59	22154,50	14651,500	-2,952	,003	Ungifted Students	293	218,99	64165,50	Body Image	Gifted Students	122	192,26	23455,50	15952,500	-1,735	,083	Ungifted Students	293	214,55	62864,50	Emotional Level	Gifted Students	122	174,29	21263,50	13760,500	-3,698	,000	Ungifted Students	293	222,04	65056,50	Adaptation to Environment	Gifted Students	122	184,21	22474,00	14971,000	-2,644	,008	Ungifted Students	293	217,90	63846,00	Occupational and Educational Goals	Gifted Students	122	231,20	28206,00	15043,000	-3,031	,002	Ungifted Students	293	198,34	58114,00	Social Relations	Gifted Students	122	185,19	22593,50	15090,500	-2,504	,012	Ungifted Students	293	217,50	63726,50	Mental Health	Gifted Students	122	165,78	20225,50	12722,500	-4,589	,000	Ungifted Students	293	224,93	65679,50	Total	Gifted Students	121	173,35	20854,50	13473,500	-3,754	0,000
Impulse Control	Gifted Students	122	174,29	21263,50	13760,500	-3,698	,000																																																																																																																				
	Ungifted Students	293	222,04	65056,50				Sexual Attitudes	Gifted Students	122	217,26	26289,00	16424,000	-1,146	,252	Ungifted Students	293	202,75	59202,00	Coping Strength	Gifted Students	122	181,59	22154,50	14651,500	-2,952	,003	Ungifted Students	293	218,99	64165,50	Body Image	Gifted Students	122	192,26	23455,50	15952,500	-1,735	,083	Ungifted Students	293	214,55	62864,50	Emotional Level	Gifted Students	122	174,29	21263,50	13760,500	-3,698	,000	Ungifted Students	293	222,04	65056,50	Adaptation to Environment	Gifted Students	122	184,21	22474,00	14971,000	-2,644	,008	Ungifted Students	293	217,90	63846,00	Occupational and Educational Goals	Gifted Students	122	231,20	28206,00	15043,000	-3,031	,002	Ungifted Students	293	198,34	58114,00	Social Relations	Gifted Students	122	185,19	22593,50	15090,500	-2,504	,012	Ungifted Students	293	217,50	63726,50	Mental Health	Gifted Students	122	165,78	20225,50	12722,500	-4,589	,000	Ungifted Students	293	224,93	65679,50	Total	Gifted Students	121	173,35	20854,50	13473,500	-3,754	0,000	Ungifted Students	291	220,70	64223,50								
Sexual Attitudes	Gifted Students	122	217,26	26289,00	16424,000	-1,146	,252																																																																																																																				
	Ungifted Students	293	202,75	59202,00				Coping Strength	Gifted Students	122	181,59	22154,50	14651,500	-2,952	,003	Ungifted Students	293	218,99	64165,50	Body Image	Gifted Students	122	192,26	23455,50	15952,500	-1,735	,083	Ungifted Students	293	214,55	62864,50	Emotional Level	Gifted Students	122	174,29	21263,50	13760,500	-3,698	,000	Ungifted Students	293	222,04	65056,50	Adaptation to Environment	Gifted Students	122	184,21	22474,00	14971,000	-2,644	,008	Ungifted Students	293	217,90	63846,00	Occupational and Educational Goals	Gifted Students	122	231,20	28206,00	15043,000	-3,031	,002	Ungifted Students	293	198,34	58114,00	Social Relations	Gifted Students	122	185,19	22593,50	15090,500	-2,504	,012	Ungifted Students	293	217,50	63726,50	Mental Health	Gifted Students	122	165,78	20225,50	12722,500	-4,589	,000	Ungifted Students	293	224,93	65679,50	Total	Gifted Students	121	173,35	20854,50	13473,500	-3,754	0,000	Ungifted Students	291	220,70	64223,50																				
Coping Strength	Gifted Students	122	181,59	22154,50	14651,500	-2,952	,003																																																																																																																				
	Ungifted Students	293	218,99	64165,50				Body Image	Gifted Students	122	192,26	23455,50	15952,500	-1,735	,083	Ungifted Students	293	214,55	62864,50	Emotional Level	Gifted Students	122	174,29	21263,50	13760,500	-3,698	,000	Ungifted Students	293	222,04	65056,50	Adaptation to Environment	Gifted Students	122	184,21	22474,00	14971,000	-2,644	,008	Ungifted Students	293	217,90	63846,00	Occupational and Educational Goals	Gifted Students	122	231,20	28206,00	15043,000	-3,031	,002	Ungifted Students	293	198,34	58114,00	Social Relations	Gifted Students	122	185,19	22593,50	15090,500	-2,504	,012	Ungifted Students	293	217,50	63726,50	Mental Health	Gifted Students	122	165,78	20225,50	12722,500	-4,589	,000	Ungifted Students	293	224,93	65679,50	Total	Gifted Students	121	173,35	20854,50	13473,500	-3,754	0,000	Ungifted Students	291	220,70	64223,50																																
Body Image	Gifted Students	122	192,26	23455,50	15952,500	-1,735	,083																																																																																																																				
	Ungifted Students	293	214,55	62864,50				Emotional Level	Gifted Students	122	174,29	21263,50	13760,500	-3,698	,000	Ungifted Students	293	222,04	65056,50	Adaptation to Environment	Gifted Students	122	184,21	22474,00	14971,000	-2,644	,008	Ungifted Students	293	217,90	63846,00	Occupational and Educational Goals	Gifted Students	122	231,20	28206,00	15043,000	-3,031	,002	Ungifted Students	293	198,34	58114,00	Social Relations	Gifted Students	122	185,19	22593,50	15090,500	-2,504	,012	Ungifted Students	293	217,50	63726,50	Mental Health	Gifted Students	122	165,78	20225,50	12722,500	-4,589	,000	Ungifted Students	293	224,93	65679,50	Total	Gifted Students	121	173,35	20854,50	13473,500	-3,754	0,000	Ungifted Students	291	220,70	64223,50																																												
Emotional Level	Gifted Students	122	174,29	21263,50	13760,500	-3,698	,000																																																																																																																				
	Ungifted Students	293	222,04	65056,50				Adaptation to Environment	Gifted Students	122	184,21	22474,00	14971,000	-2,644	,008	Ungifted Students	293	217,90	63846,00	Occupational and Educational Goals	Gifted Students	122	231,20	28206,00	15043,000	-3,031	,002	Ungifted Students	293	198,34	58114,00	Social Relations	Gifted Students	122	185,19	22593,50	15090,500	-2,504	,012	Ungifted Students	293	217,50	63726,50	Mental Health	Gifted Students	122	165,78	20225,50	12722,500	-4,589	,000	Ungifted Students	293	224,93	65679,50	Total	Gifted Students	121	173,35	20854,50	13473,500	-3,754	0,000	Ungifted Students	291	220,70	64223,50																																																								
Adaptation to Environment	Gifted Students	122	184,21	22474,00	14971,000	-2,644	,008																																																																																																																				
	Ungifted Students	293	217,90	63846,00				Occupational and Educational Goals	Gifted Students	122	231,20	28206,00	15043,000	-3,031	,002	Ungifted Students	293	198,34	58114,00	Social Relations	Gifted Students	122	185,19	22593,50	15090,500	-2,504	,012	Ungifted Students	293	217,50	63726,50	Mental Health	Gifted Students	122	165,78	20225,50	12722,500	-4,589	,000	Ungifted Students	293	224,93	65679,50	Total	Gifted Students	121	173,35	20854,50	13473,500	-3,754	0,000	Ungifted Students	291	220,70	64223,50																																																																				
Occupational and Educational Goals	Gifted Students	122	231,20	28206,00	15043,000	-3,031	,002																																																																																																																				
	Ungifted Students	293	198,34	58114,00				Social Relations	Gifted Students	122	185,19	22593,50	15090,500	-2,504	,012	Ungifted Students	293	217,50	63726,50	Mental Health	Gifted Students	122	165,78	20225,50	12722,500	-4,589	,000	Ungifted Students	293	224,93	65679,50	Total	Gifted Students	121	173,35	20854,50	13473,500	-3,754	0,000	Ungifted Students	291	220,70	64223,50																																																																																
Social Relations	Gifted Students	122	185,19	22593,50	15090,500	-2,504	,012																																																																																																																				
	Ungifted Students	293	217,50	63726,50				Mental Health	Gifted Students	122	165,78	20225,50	12722,500	-4,589	,000	Ungifted Students	293	224,93	65679,50	Total	Gifted Students	121	173,35	20854,50	13473,500	-3,754	0,000	Ungifted Students	291	220,70	64223,50																																																																																												
Mental Health	Gifted Students	122	165,78	20225,50	12722,500	-4,589	,000																																																																																																																				
	Ungifted Students	293	224,93	65679,50				Total	Gifted Students	121	173,35	20854,50	13473,500	-3,754	0,000	Ungifted Students	291	220,70	64223,50																																																																																																								
Total	Gifted Students	121	173,35	20854,50	13473,500	-3,754	0,000																																																																																																																				
	Ungifted Students	291	220,70	64223,50																																																																																																																							

When Table-5 is examined, it appears that there is found a statistically significant difference between self-perceptions of gifted and ungifted students ($U= 13473,500$, $p<0,05$). When mean ranks and rank-sum related to self-perception total scores are analyzed, it is seen that self-perceptions of ungifted students are lower than self-perceptions of gifted students. When sub-scales in Table-19 are examined, there is found no significant difference between Sexual Attitudes and Body Image Sub-scales ($U_{\text{sexual Attitudes}}=16424,000$, $p>0,05$; $U_{\text{Body Image}}=14651,500$, $p>0,05$). However, there is found a statistically significant difference depending on being gifted or ungifted among the following sub-scales: Family Relations, Impulse Control, Coping Strength, Emotional Level, Adaptation to Environment, Occupational and Educational Goals, Social

Relations and Mental Health Sub-scales ($U_{\text{Family Relations}}=15475,000$, $p<0,05$; $U_{\text{Impulse Control}}=13760,500$, $p<0,05$; $U_{\text{Coping Strength}}=14651,500$, $p<0,05$; $U_{\text{Emotional Level}}=13760,500$, $p<0,05$; $U_{\text{Adaptation to Environment}}=14971,000$, $p<0,05$; $U_{\text{Occupational and Educational Goals}}=15043,000$, $p<0,05$; $U_{\text{social Relations}}=15090,500$, $p<0,05$; $U_{\text{Mental Health}}=12722,500$, $p<0,05$). When mean ranks and rank-sum are examined related to scores in sub-scales of Family Relations, Impulse Control, Coping Strength, Emotional Level, Adaptation to Environment, Occupational and Educational Goals, Social Relations and Mental Health, it is seen that gifted students have higher self-perceptions in all these sub-scales compared to ungifted students' self-perceptions. It has been identified that ungifted students have lower self-perceptions in total and sub-scale scores compared to gifted students.

4. Discussion and Results

As a result of the study, it can be expressed that parenting styles adopted by parents are generally related to self-perceptions of students. It has been observed that gifted students with high self-perceptions have mothers who adopt permissive/indulgent parenting style and students who have low self-perceptions have mothers who adopt permissive/neglectful parenting style. It has been evident that gifted students with high self-perceptions have both mothers and fathers who adopt permissive/indulgent parenting style. However, it has come out that while students with low self-perceptions have mothers who adopt permissive/neglectful parenting style, their fathers adopt authoritative parenting style. It is found out that self-perceptions of gifted students are higher than ungifted students. Most of the mothers and fathers who graduated from a university adopt permissive/indulgent parenting style.

When literature regarding to these results are reviewed, in study of Sümer and Güngör (1999), it was established that self-esteems of university students significantly differ depending on parenting styles. There exist some studies in literature which indicate that the perception of parents as explanatory/authoritative is related to the increase in self-respect (Aunola, Stattin and Nurmi, 2000; Herz and Gullone, 1999). In another study, high self-esteem is related to democratic parenting style perceived from both mother and father (Milevsky et al., 2007). The study of Weiten and Lloyd (2006) partially supports this finding, as well. As a result of their study, they emphasized that children grown in a democratic and permissive/indulgent parental environment have higher self-esteems compared to others.

There are several studies in literature which come up different findings about this research topic. Some studies reveal that gifted students' self-perceptions are relatively more positive than normal children (Karnes and Wherry, 1981; Pyryt and

Mendaglio, 1994). Hoge and Renzulli (1993) analyzed the findings of fifteen studies which comparatively examine self-perceptions of gifted students and they found out that gifted students have generally slightly more positive self-perceptions compared to normal students. The findings obtained from fifteen studies about the concept of self have been analyzed by coding them under five categories (general, academic, behavior, physical, social). As a result, they confirmed that gifted students have more positive perceptions in terms of academic and behavioral self-compared to normal group (Coleman and Fults, 1982; Altun and Yazıcı, 2012). In his study with 6th, 7th and 8th grade normal and gifted students, Yürük (2003) concluded that gifted male students have more positive self-perceptions than their peers and gifted female students. Similarly, McCoach et al. (2002) found out that gifted students perceive themselves more successful academically than their peers with normal development.

However, some studies come up with the contrary findings which indicate that there is no statistically significant difference in terms of self-concept between gifted students and normal students (Loeb and Jay, 1987; Cornell, 1983). Likewise, Burak (1995) conducted a comparative study with gifted and normal students and his study revealed that there is found no significant difference in positiveness levels of students related to their concept of self. Also, Bartel and Reynold (1986) made a research with gifted and ungifted 4th and 5th grade students (n=145) about their self-perceptions and depression tendency and they concluded that there is no significant difference between gifted and ungifted students.

Considering the role of parents' attitudes and their education in development of children, it can be advised that couples should undergo parental education before they become parent. Considering that gifted students have a potential of great achievements, it is beneficial to inform parents about the needs, developments and academic success of their gifted children and help them to adopt a supportive attitude. Schools should organize trainings for parents about self-development of their children. There should be created promotive and supporting environments for gifted individuals in order to succeed their self-actualization. There should be available professional support for teachers in terms of learning activities to support development of gifted students. In the following studies, parental education programs should be developed and efficient studies should be conducted which would support and promote students' self-esteem and self-confidence.

References

1. Altun, F. ve Yazıcı, H. (2012). Üstün Yetenekli Öğrencilerin Benlik Kavramları ve Akademik Öz-Yeterlik İnançları: Karşılaştırmalı Bir Çalışma. [Gifted Students' Self-Concepts and Their Academic Self-Efficacy Beliefs: A Comparative Study] *Mehmet Akif Ersoy Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 23, s. 319 – 334.
2. Aunola, K., Stattin, H. ve Nunni, J. (2000). Parenting Style and Adolescents' Achievement Strategies. *Journal of Adolescence*, 23, p. 205-222.
3. Balcı, A. (2011). *Sosyal Bilimlerde Araştırma*, [Research in Social Sciences] Ankara: Pegem Akademi.
4. Bartel, N. P. ve Reynolds, W. M. (1986). Depression and Self-Esteem in Academically Gifted and Nongifted Children: A Comparison Study. *Journal of School Psychology*, 24, p. 55-61.
5. Burak, E. M. (1995). *Üstün Yetenekli Öğrencilerin Benlik Kavramlarına İlişkin Bir Araştırma*. [A Study on Gifted Students' Self-Concepts]Yayınlanmamış yüksek lisans tezi, A.Ü. Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Ankara.
6. Christensen, L. B., Johnson, R.B., Turner, L.A. (2015). *Araştırma Yöntemleri Desen ve Analiz*. [Research Method Designs and Analysis](Çev.Ed. A. Aypay) Ankara: Anı Yayıncılık.
7. Coleman, J. M., & Fults, B. A. (1982). Self-concept and the gifted classroom: The role of social comparisons. *Gifted Child Quarterly*. Vol 26(3), p. 116-120.
8. Cornell, D. G. (1983). Gifted Children. The Impact of Positive Labelling on the Family System. *American Journal of Ortopsychiatry*, 53, p. 322-335.
9. Cüceloğlu D. (2000). *İnsan ve Davranışı*,[Human and His Behavior] İstanbul: Remzi Kitabevi.
10. Çelik, H.E. ve Yılmaz, V. (2013). *Lisrel 9.1 ile Yapısal Eşitlik Modellemesi Temel Kavramlar, Uygulamalar, Programlama*. [Basic Concepts, Practices and Programming in Structural Equation Modelling with Lisrel 9.1] Ankara: Anı Yayıncılık.
11. Demoulin, D.F. (1999). A Personalized Development of Self-Concept for Beginning Readers. *Education*, 120(1).
12. Garcia, F. ve Gracia E. (2009). Is Always Authoritative the Optimum Parenting Style? Evidence from Spanish Families. *Adolescence*, 44(173), p. 101-131
13. Gardner, H. (1993). *Multiple intelligences: The theory in practice*. New York: Basic Books.
14. Greenberg, J. (1986). Determinants of Perceived Fairness of Performance Evaluations. *Journal of Applied Psychology*. 2(71), p. 340-342.

15. Heppner PP, Wampold BE, Kivlighan DM. (2013). Jr. Research design in counseling. 3rd ed. Brooks/Cole; Belmont, CA.
16. Herz, L. ve Gullone, E. (1999). The Relationship Between Self-Esteem and Parenting Style: A Cross-cultural Comparison of Australian and Vietnamese Australian Adolescents. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 30(6), p. 742-761.
17. Hoge, R.D. and Renzulli, J.S. (1993). Exploring the link between giftedness and self-concept. *Review of Educational Research*. 63: 449-465.
18. Kağıtçıbaşı, Ç. (2012). *Benlik, Aile ve İnsan Gelişimi*. [Self-concept, Family and Human Development] (3. Basım). İstanbul: Koç Üniversitesi Yayınları.
19. Karnes. F.A. ve Wherry, J.N. (1981). Self-concepts of gifted students as measured by the Piers- Harris Children's Self-Concept Scale, *Psychological Reports*, 49(3), p. 9-14.
20. Kuzgun, Y. (2000). *Meslek Danışmanlığı*, [Vocational Counselling] Ankara: Nobel Yayıncılık.
21. Loeb, R. C. & Jay, G. (1987). Self Concept in the Gifted Children: Differential Impact in Boys and Girls. *Gifted Child Quarterly*, 31, p. 4-9.
22. Maccoby, E. E. ve Martin, J. A. (1983). Socialization in the Context of the Family: Parent-Child Interaction, P.H.Mussen, ve E. M. Hetherington (Ed.), *Handbook of Child Psychology*, Cil IV Socialization, Personality and Social Development, New York, Wiley, p. 1-101.
23. Marland, S. P. (1972). *Education of the Gifted and Talented: Report to the Congress of the United States by the U.S. Commissioner of Education*. Washington: U.S. Government Printing Office.
24. Milevsky, A., Schlechter, M., Netter, S. ve Keehn, D. (2007). Maternal and Paternal Parenting Style in Adolescents: Associations with Self Esteem, Depression, and Life Satisfaction. *Journal of Child and Family Studies*, 16, p. 39-47.
25. Özgüven, İ.E. (2011). *Psikolojik Testler*. [Psychological Tests] Ankara: Pdrem Yayınları.
26. Pyryt, M.C. ve Mendaglio, S. (1994). The multidimensional Self-concept: A Comparison of Gifted and Average-Ability Adolescents, *Journal for the Education of the Gifted*, 17(3), p. 299-305.
27. Reis, S. M., & McCoach, D. B. (2002). Underachievement in gifted and talented students with special needs. *Exceptionality*, 10(2), 113-125.
28. Savaşır I. Ve Şahin, N.H. (1997). *Bilişsel-davranışçı terapilerde değerlendirme: Sık kullanılan ölçekler*. [*Evaluation in Cognitive-Behavioral Therapies: Frequently Used Scales*]Ankara: Türk Psikologlar Derneği Yayınları.

29. Sümer, N. (2000). Yapısal eşitlik modelleri: Temel kavramlar ve örnek uygulamalar.[Structural Equation Models: Basic Concepts and Sample Practices] *Türk Psikoloji Yazıları*, 3 (6), 49-74.
30. Sümer, N. ve Güngör D. (1999). Çocuk Yetiştirme Stillerinin Bağlanma Stilleri, Benlik Değerlendirmeleri ve Yakın İlişkiler Üzerindeki Etkisi.[The Effect of Parenting Styles on Attachment Styles, Self Evaluations and Intimate Relationships] *Türk Psikoloji Dergisi*, 14(44), s. 35-58.
31. Şahin, N. (1993). *Offer Benlik İmgesi Ölçeği El Kitabı*. [Offer Self- Image Scale Handbook]
32. Uyanık, (2007). Üstün Yetenekli Çocuklarda Mükemmeliyetçilik, Yalnızlık ve Kendine Saygı Düzeyinin Sınav Kaygısı Üzerindeki Etkileri, [The Effect of Gifted Students' Level of Perfectionism, Loneliness and Self-Esteem on Exam Anxiety] Yayımlanmış Yüksek Lisans Tezi, Bursa: Uludağ Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü.
33. Wechsler, D. (1981). Manual for the Wechsler Adult Intelligence Scale—Revised. New York: Psychological Corporation.
34. Weiten, W. ve Lloyd, M.A. (2006). *Psychology Applied to Modern Life: Adjustment in the 21st Century*, USA: Belmont CA.

Creative Commons licensing terms

Author(s) will retain the copyright of their published articles agreeing that a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License (CC BY 4.0) terms will be applied to their work. Under the terms of this license, no permission is required from the author(s) or publisher for members of the community to copy, distribute, transmit or adapt the article content, providing a proper, prominent and unambiguous attribution to the authors in a manner that makes clear that the materials are being reused under permission of a Creative Commons License. Views, opinions and conclusions expressed in this research article are views, opinions and conclusions of the author(s). Open Access Publishing Group and European Journal of Education Studies shall not be responsible or answerable for any loss, damage or liability caused in relation to/arising out of conflicts of interest, copyright violations and inappropriate or inaccurate use of any kind content related or integrated into the research work. All the published works are meeting the Open Access Publishing requirements and can be freely accessed, shared, modified, distributed and used in educational, commercial and non-commercial purposes under a [Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License \(CC BY 4.0\)](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/).