

Durham E-Theses

A study of leadership development programme for gifted primary school students in South Korea

Seung Hee Ahn

How to cite:

Ahn, Seung Hee (2008) A study of leadership development programme for gifted primary school students in South Korea. Doctoral thesis, Durham University.

Use policy

The full-text may be used and/or reproduced, and given to third parties in any format or medium, without prior permission or charge, for personal research or study, educational, or not-for-profit purposes provided that:

- a full bibliographic reference is made to the original source
- a <https://etheses.durham.ac.uk/id/eprint/2178/> is made to the metadata record in Durham E-Theses
- the full-text is not changed in any way

The full-text must not be sold in any format or medium without the formal permission of the copyright holders.

Please consult the [full Durham E-Theses policy](#) for further details.

A STUDY OF LEADERSHIP
DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMME FOR
GIFTED PRIMARY SCHOOL STUDENTS IN
SOUTH KOREA

SEUNG HEE AHN

The copyright of this thesis rests with the author or the university to which it was submitted. No quotation from it, or information derived from it may be published without the prior written consent of the author or university, and any information derived from it should be acknowledged.

THESIS SUBMITTED AS A REQUIREMENT FOR THE
DEGREE OF DOCTOR OF EDUCATION

SCHOOL OF EDUCATION
UNIVERSITY OF DURHAM

2008



18 APR 2008

Declarations

This work has not previously been submitted for a degree or diploma in a university. To the best of my knowledge and belief, the thesis contains no material, previously published, or written by another person, except where due reference is made in the thesis itself.

Signed: *Seung Hee Ahn*

Name: Seung Hee Ahn

Date: 22 February 2008

Abstract

A Study of Leadership Development Programme for Gifted Primary School Students in South Korea

By

Seung Hee Ahn

University of Durham

This thesis investigates leadership development in the gifted primary school students of South Korea. It ultimately aims to make suggestions toward the formulation and implementation of a model leadership gifted curriculum and programme specific to the Korean cultural and educational setting.

The bases of the suggestions were assembled from three sources: literature pertaining to the relevant topics of the thesis, available leadership gifted curricula and programmes, and the perspectives of Korean gifted educators.

The views of the Korean gifted teachers were investigated using mixed methods or methodological triangulation; the measurement instruments employed in this study were a tripartite questionnaire survey and complementary semi-structured interviews. Fifty Korean gifted teachers teaching at mainstream national and state primary schools, Centres for the Gifted, and specialised gifted schools partook in the questionnaire survey. Two Korean gifted teachers from mainstream state primary schools and the director of the Korean Educational Development Institute (KEDI) were interviewed to supplement the data collected through the questionnaires.

The results illuminated the Korean gifted educational context and highlighted the lack and the need for leadership development for the gifted. Through the comprehensive review of the literature review, available curricula/programmes, and results of this study, final suggestions for a prospective leadership gifted curriculum and programme were made. Three main guidelines

were proposed; firstly, a model of the prospective contents of leadership gifted education, named the Four Areas Leadership Model (FALM); secondly, the suggestions for the implementation of the FALM in a *curriculum* format; finally, the suggestions for the implementation of the FALM in a *programme* format. The FALM adopted the framework of Parker's (1983) Leadership Training Model, and its implementation as a programme was adapted from Renzulli's (1976, 1986) Enrichment Triad Model's implementation scheme which was considered appropriate to the Korean context.

Table of Contents

Abstract.....	i
Table of Contents.....	iii
Acknowledgements.....	vii
List of Tables.....	ix
List of Figures.....	xii
List of Abbreviations.....	xiii

Declarations

Chapter 1	Introduction.....	1
	1.1. Research Rationale	1
	1.2. Leadership Gifted Education.....	4
	1.3. Overview of the Thesis and Statement of Research Questions.....	5
Chapter 2	Literature Review.....	10
	2.1. Literature Review I: Giftedness.....	10
	2.1.1. Definitions and Perspectives of Giftedness.....	10
	2.1.2. Characteristics of Gifted Students.....	16
	2.1.3. Contextual Background of Gifted Education in South Korea ...	17
	Cultural Background	
	Political Background	
	Historical Background	
	2.1.4. Gifted Education Institutions in South Korea.....	21
	2.1.5. Methods of Identification of Gifted Students.....	22
	2.2. Literature Review II: Leadership.....	35
	2.2.1. Definitions of Leadership.....	35
	2.2.2. Characteristics of Leaders.....	35

2.2.3. Development of Leadership Theories.....	38
Trait Theory	
Behaviour Theory	
Situational Theory	
Transformation and Transactional Theories	
Style Theory	
2.3. Literature Review III: Giftedness with Leadership.....	42
2.4. Literature Review IV: Leadership Gifted Curricula.....	45
2.4.1. Components of a Leadership Gifted Curriculum and Programmes.....	45
2.4.2. Potential Developments of Leadership Curricula.....	46
2.4.3. Literature in the Area of Leadership Gifted Curricula.....	47
2.5. Cultural Differences.....	48
2.5.1. Definitions of Culture.....	48
2.5.2. The Comparison Eastern and Western Cultures.....	49
2.5.3. Korean Education.....	50
2.5.4. Culture and Gifted Education.....	50
2.5.5. Culture and Leadership.....	51
2.5.6. Culture and Leadership Gifted Education.....	53
2.6. Conclusion.....	53

Chapter 3	An Investigation of Korean Gifted Education Teachers' Views on Leadership (50 Schools).....	55
3.1. Methodology.....	56	
3.1.1. Sampling.....	56	
3.1.2. Pilot Study and Research Paradigm.....	58	
3.1.3. Questionnaire.....	61	
3.1.4. Interviews.....	63	
3.1.5. Reliability and Validity.....	64	
3.1.6. Ethical Considerations.....	66	

	3.2. Results	67
	3.2.1. Questionnaire Results	67
	3.2.2. Interview Results	79
	3.3. Data Discussion and Analysis	83
	3.3.1. Korean Gifted Education Situation	83
	3.3.2. To What Extent Are Good Leaders Born or Made?	87
	3.3.3. Curricula and Teaching Materials	89
	3.3.4. Leadership Education and Moral Education	90
	3.4. Conclusion	91
Chapter 4	Theoretical Bases for a Model Curriculum	94
	4.1. Results of QTOGGLE and Interviews	95
	4.1.1. Self-development	97
	4.1.2. Social Development	98
	4.1.3. Moral Development	99
	4.1.4. Leadership Development	100
	4.1.5. Conclusion	102
	4.2. Leadership Gifted Curriculum Contents: An Overview of Leadership Gifted Curricula and Programmes	104
	4.3. Parker's (1983) Leadership Training Model	109
	4.3.1. Four Areas Leadership Model Based on Parker's (1983) Leadership Training Model	109
	4.3.2. A Comparison of Parker's (1983) Leadership Training Model and Leadership Four Areas Model	117
	4.4. Conclusion	120
Chapter 5	A Study of the Four Areas of Development for Leadership	122

5.1. Self-development	122
5.1.1. Self-esteem	123
5.1.2. Self-development Programme	126
5.2. Social Development	128
5.2.1. The Importance of Social Development	129
5.2.2. Interpersonal Relationships	129
5.3. Moral Development	130
5.3.1. Definition	131
5.3.2. Moral Education	132
5.3.3. Problems of Moral Education in Korea	133
5.3.4. Contents of Moral Education	135
5.3.5. Teaching Methods for Moral Education	136
5.3.6. Values	138
5.3.7. Character Development	140
5.3.8. Conclusion	141
5.4. Leadership Development	142
5.4.1. Fundamentals of Leadership Development	142
5.4.2. Contents of Programmes and Curricula of Leadership Growth	143
Problem Solving Skills	
Decision Making Skills	
Communication Skills	
Thinking Skills	
Speech Skills	
5.4.4. Methods to Develop Leadership Skills	154
5.4.5 Conclusion	155

Chapter 6 A Suggested Model Curriculum

157

6.1. The Foundation of Gifted Education Curricula

157

6.2. The Importance of Gifted Education Programmes

158

6.3. Types of Gifted Programmes	159
6.3.1. Accelerated Gifted Programmes	162
6.3.2. Enrichment Learning Programmes	165
6.3.3. Gifted Programmes Based on Intelligence Theories	171
6.4. Korean Gifted Education Programmes	172
6.4.1. Current Gifted Programmes in Korea	172
6.4.2. Current Situation in Gifted Education Programmes and Tasks for the Future	174
6.5. A Suggested Model Curriculum	176
6.5.1. A Leadership Model (Based on Parker's (1983) Leadership Training Model)	178
6.5.2. A Leadership Model (Based on Renzulli's (1976, 1986b) Enrichment Triad Model)	179
6.6. Conclusion	187
Chapter 7 Conclusions	189
7.1. Summary of Research Findings	189
7.2. Limitations and Recommendations for Future Research	192
Appendix	195
Notes	233
Bibliography	236

Dedication

This thesis is dedicated to my husband Jeen Ho Ahn, who has completely sacrificed himself through the years of my study.

Acknowledgements

I thank my supervisor Dr. Barbara Riddick, who guided me through the entire process and provided me with much appreciated encouragement. This research could not have been conducted without the support of the members of the Department of Education, University of Durham.

I thank the participants of my research who answered my questionnaires and were interviewed. Your responses have endowed Korean leadership gifted education a good direction for further research.

I was very blessed to have the unconditional support of my family, church and friends. I am indebted to the encouragement and support that my husband and two daughters gave me throughout the course of this doctorate. I would like to whole-heartedly say thank you to you all.

List of Tables

- Table 1.1 Statements of Research Questions
- Table 2.1 Popular Intelligence Tests.
- Table 2.2 Characteristics of Leaders.
- Table 3.1 The Number of Schools the Questionnaire was sent to, and the Number of Schools that Responded per Each Type of Gifted Education Providers in Korea.
- Table 3.2 The Positions of the Teachers who Responded to the Questionnaire and the Number of Teachers Holding Each Position.
- Table 3.3 The Respondent Teachers' Periods of Teaching.
- Table 3.4 Teachers' Estimated Percentages of Leadership Gifted Students in Every Gifted Class
- Table 3.5 A Table to Show the Advantages and Disadvantages of the Current Leadership Curricula or Programmes used in Korea.
- Table 3.6 Summarised Categories and Suggested Components of Leadership Development Curriculum or Programme.
- Table 3.7 Suggested Components of Leadership Development Curriculum or Programme by the Teachers in the Order of Importance.
- Table 3.8 A Table to show what the Teachers believe the Goals of Gifted Education to be.
- Table 3.9 Teachers' Opinions on the Number of Hours Students Should Receive Leadership Education.
- Table 3.10 Teachers' Views on the Most Adequate Age for Leadership Education to Begin.

- Table 3.11 Teachers' Views on the Most Suitable Teacher for Teaching Leadership Curricula.
- Table 4.1 Results of QTOGGLE on the Content of a Leadership Development Curriculum or Programme.
- Table 4.2 Suggested Topics Related to 'Social Development' in the Kim, Jun and Kim's (2005) Leadership Skills Categories and the Frequency of the Suggested Topics Mentioned by the Teachers in the QTOGGLE Results.
- Table 4.3 Suggested Topics Related to 'Leadership Development' in the Kim, Jun and Kim's (2005) Leadership Skills Categories and the Frequency of the Suggested Topics Mentioned by the Teachers in the QTOGGLE Results.
- Table 4.4 Preference Percentage of Suggested Leadership Curriculum Contents by QTOGGLE Teacher Participants.
- Table 4.5 Contents of Six Leadership Gifted Programmes.
- Table 4.6 The Contents of the 6 Leadership Gifted Programmes and the Frequency of the Topics Mentioned.
- Table 4.7 The Leadership Training Model
- Table 4.8 Four Areas Leadership Model (FALM). An adapted and developed version of Parker's (1983) Leadership Training Model
- Table 4.9 A Comparison of Interpersonal Communication in LTM (Parker, 1983) and Social Development in FALM.
- Table 4.10 A Comparison of Decision Making in LTM (Parker, 1983) and Moral Development FALM.
- Table 4.11 A Comparison of Cognition in LTM (Parker, 1983) and Leadership Development in FALM.

Table 4.12 The Comparison of LTM (Parker, 1983) and FALM.

Table 5.1 Western Views on the Contents of Moral Education.

Table 5.2 Korean Views on the Contents of Moral Education.

Table 5.3 PS/DM Model.

Table 5.4 An Approach to the Guidance of Critical Thinking Skills.

Table 6.1 Comparisons of Gifted Programmes of Acceleration, Enrichment, and Intelligence Theories (Park, 2006, p. 29).

Table 6.2 Exemplar FALM Activities (Adapted from Parker & Begnaud, 1984).

Table 6.3 Training Activities for Type II (Renzulli, 1996; Huh, 2005).

Table 6.4 The Three Enrichment Learning Types of Renzulli and Reis' (1991, pp. 101, 104 and 118) Models.

Table 6.5 The Contents of a Model Leadership Development Programme; Framework adapted from Renzulli (2000), Beane (1993) and Various Authors.

List of Figures

- Figure 2.1 The Four-stage Process of Giftedness Assessment Recommended in Korea (S. H. Cho, 2005)
- Figure 3.1 The Number of Teachers who Participated per Each Type of School.
- Figure 3.2 The Estimated Percentage of Gifted Students with Leadership Skills.
- Figure 4.1 Theoretical Bases of Suggestions for a Model Leadership Gifted Curriculum.
- Figure 5.1 Self-concept: The Three Components and their Brief Descriptions.
- Figure 6.1 The Implementation of the FALM in Curricular and Programme Levels: Three Main Suggestions Made for a Model Leadership Gifted Curricula and Programme.
- Figure 6.2 The Target Population for a Leadership Development Enrichment Programme.

List of Abbreviations

Four Areas Leadership Model.....	FALM
Gyeonggi Do Educational Research Centre.....	GERC
Korean Educational Development Institute.....	KEDI
Ministry of Education and Human Resources Development.....	MOEHRD
National Institute for International Education Development.....	NIED
Questionnaire on Teachers' Opinions on Gifted and Leadership Education.....	QTOGLE
The Leadership Training Model.....	LTM

Chapter 1: Introduction

This thesis investigates the development of leadership skills in gifted primary school students within the educational and cultural setting of South Korea. It aims to provide theoretical and practical suggestions for the formation and implementation of a model leadership training curriculum and programme for gifted students in Korean primary schools. In assessing the current situation of Korean gifted education, questionnaire surveys and interviews were conducted on primary school teachers teaching gifted education, where their beliefs and attitudes regarding gifted and leadership curricula and programmes were enquired. The results highlighted the need for leadership education for the gifted students of South Korea. This thesis aims to ultimately benefit the Korean gifted primary school student who exhibits either leadership abilities or potential.

This thesis uses a mixed methods approach, using both qualitative and quantitative research methods such as interviews and questionnaire surveys so that the issues related to developing leadership curriculum and programme contents can be more comprehensively examined. Much of the research is based on qualitative research methods, through which teachers were asked open-ended questions regarding their perspectives of the current Korean educational context. Overall, the results were analysed to provide a practical and theoretical contribution to the development of leadership gifted curricula and programmes in the framework of South Korean primary school education.

1.1. Research Rationale

In this section, the relationship between leadership education and gifted students will be discussed in order to emphasise the importance of such training in gifted students.

Firstly, there is a strong line of thought that gifted students should be trained in leadership skills as they will become the leaders of our future societies. Eyre (2004) stated:

“Today’s gifted pupils are tomorrow’s social, intellectual, economic and cultural leaders and their development cannot be left to chance. Where it is left to chance, evidence indicates that educational progress is not so much a question of intellectual merit but rather a question of affluence, with the most affluent receiving the best education and therefore achieving most highly” (Eyre, 2004 cited from Brooke-Smith,



2006, p. 14).

Sisk (1993) also emphasised that all societies need highly intelligent and creative leaders and therefore gifted students must be trained in leadership. Such view was reiterated by Brooke-Shields (2006):

“A major reason for a dedicated educational focus on gifted and talented pupils is their potential to play a leading role in their adult lives. If England is to be successful in a globalized world then it will need to produce leaders who can compete and collaborate with the best” (p. 16).

This view is also reflected in the Korean government which maintained that gifted education is conducted to train leaders as the gifted “will be able to exhibit their abilities as leaders working towards national development and humanity” (M. S. Kim, 2004, p. 30).

Secondly, there is research to suggest that many gifted students do become leaders in their fields. The relationship between leadership and giftedness was evident even in the beginning of the 20th century; Terman’s (1925) research in giftedness found that many gifted students adopted a role of leadership in their own schools. Hollingworth (1926) similarly related leadership ability with giftedness with her discovery that amongst children of average abilities, those who were leaders had an average I.Q. score of 115-130. Such belief was more recently supported in a research of 4000 middle school students, involving 10 cognitive and affective assessments, when it was found that gifted students were more likely to have leadership abilities than typical students as they showed more characteristics including sensitivity towards others and the desire to help others (Kim, Cho, Yoon, & Jin, 2004, p. 184). Silverman (1993) found that gifted children are more likely to become leaders even when young as “developmentally advanced children tend to be socially mature, able to take the needs of others into account, and able to solve social problems. Because of these traits, they are valued by their peers and often chosen as leaders” (p. 292). However, this assumption invites the inference that the gifted do not require special training and extra educational provisions as a select gifted few would inevitably become leaders without any determinate leadership intervention and can hinder the formal processes of identifying and developing leadership skills within the gifted.

Thirdly, it has been reported that traits found in gifted students are similar to those with leadership skills; common traits include sociability, problem solving ability and ambitiousness

(Plowman, 1981; Black, 1984; Karnes & Bean, 2001).¹ Renzulli, Smith, White, Callahan, & Hartman (1976) understood leadership skills to be one of the traits of the gifted.

Fourthly, much literature documenting the characteristics of gifted students shows leadership abilities as one of many skills that they possess. Cawood (1984) noted the recognised association between leadership abilities and giftedness: “leadership potential as one manifestation of giftedness is commonly referred to in international descriptions of gifted students” (p. 2). An example of such definition is the ‘Marland Report’ (U.S. Commissioner of Education, 1972) where the definition of giftedness highlighted that gifted students could be defined as those who have leadership ability amongst other abilities. Furthermore, Gardner’s (1983, 1993, and 1995) multiple intelligences theory suggests that gifted characteristics include leadership skills. Overall, due to the common traits between gifted and leadership ability students and the fact that gifted students are more likely to be chosen as leaders, Silverman (1993, p. 292) found that “leadership ability appears to be a natural component of giftedness.”

Fifthly, there seems to be a practical need for leadership education for the gifted. This thesis argues that leadership ability can and should be developed through leadership training, and that leadership training should be elevated to a status on a par with any other academic subject taught at school. Forster and Silverman (1988) also believed that the concept of leadership should be understood by schools and provide leadership education to all, including the gifted. M. Kim (2004) echoes this belief and asserts that the skills necessary for leadership, such as consideration for others and the ability to lead a group can and should be nurtured and trained through comprehensive leadership development programmes. Many current social leaders and educationalists in Korea are also emphasising that in order to nurture gifted students, character-building education, leadership education and emotional education are necessary (Yang, 2004; K. H. Lee, 2004; Cho, 2004; Choi, 2004 cited by Korean Educational Development Institute, 2007).

In this sense, there is a necessity for leadership education in gifted students as there is a distinct relationship between leadership and giftedness. However, in spite of a clear necessity for leadership skills development, Florey and Dorf (1986) document the observation of the current evident lack of gifted programmes which encompass leadership development training, especially in the Korean context where research in giftedness or leadership education for the gifted has not yet flourished.

1.2. Leadership Gifted Education

Prior to delving into the literature review, it is important to clarify the operational definitions of the terms commonly used throughout this thesis and define the target population of this research.

In this thesis the phrase latent abilities are used to refer to those with gifted abilities but are yet to be identified as gifted; it is used interchangeably with 'potential.' The term, 'leadership gifted teachers' is used throughout to mean those who teach the leadership gifted students. This leads us to question what 'leadership gifted' denotes. The key concepts of 'leadership' and 'giftedness' are regularly referenced in this thesis and their descriptions are extensively discussed in the following chapter. The term, 'leadership gifted students' refers to students who have been formally identified as gifted, and either exhibit leadership abilities or demonstrate leadership potential. The giftedness that is mentioned here does not merely refer to academic giftedness but those with creative and well as productive giftedness, as Renzulli (1998) underlines.² This is because the definition used to delineate leadership in this thesis includes both direct leaders, such as those who are social or political leaders, and indirect leaders, who are leaders in particular fields which may or may not be in academia (Gardner, 1995).³

Furthermore, the gifted students referred to in this thesis are the typically gifted students rather than the exceptionally gifted students with an IQ score above 160 (Gross, 2002). These students are not the target population of the study as Gross (2002) state that they do not share similar traits to that of leaders. In contrast to the characteristics of leaders, the exceptionally gifted students' characteristics are less likely to support sociability (Gross, 1993, 1998): an essential skill in leadership roles.

The students whom the suggestions for a model leadership gifted curricula and programmes would benefit are those identified as leadership gifted students, which as afore-outlined includes those with leadership potential. This thesis holds that that all gifted students should be provided with an opportunity to develop their leadership abilities, should they possess any, through leadership training. This stance lies in concordance with the principle assumption underlying Renzulli's (1986) model of gifted education; Renzulli's model offers students of all abilities who display an interest in gifted students to participate in the initial stages of his gifted programme. This principle of providing education is notably applicable in the Korean setting where most Korean parents believe their children to be gifted and therefore demand special provisions to cater for their children's giftedness (Refer to Chapter 2.1.3.).

It must be emphasised that the suggestions and guidelines presented in this thesis for model leadership gifted curricula or programmes are exclusive to the framework of Korean gifted education. In other words, they are not to be implemented in mainstream education but specifically focused for the Korean gifted education system; the leadership gifted education in Korea is for a select minority of students with the specific aim to develop the future leaders of society (Park et al., 2003). Even more precisely, the thesis is targeted toward gifted students in grades 4-6 (between the ages 9 to 12) of primary school. However, there is some leeway as to the age of the students that the suggestions could be implementable to; the suggestions are also deemed to be applicable when forming leadership gifted curricula or programmes for the gifted middle schools of Korea.

The participants who have partaken in this study are the Korean gifted teachers who would implement the prospective leadership gifted curriculum and programme. Such are those teaching in gifted schools, gifted institutes, and gifted academies. These teachers have received a minimum of 60 hours (up to 120 hours) of government-approved gifted education training, and are thus, qualified in Korea to teach gifted curricula and programme. In addition to these teachers, specialists in each field are employed as approved and qualified teachers of gifted children. Teachers who participated in the questionnaires and interviews for this thesis are 50 primary school teachers in South Korea. 36 of the 50 teachers worked in state primary schools and 8 teachers worked in national primary schools. The remaining 6 teachers worked in the Centres for the Gifted (Refer to Chapter 3, Table 3.1).

1.3. Overview of the Thesis and Statement of Research Questions

Nine research questions have been devised in order to direct the structure of the thesis and to insure the comprehensiveness of the investigation of the leadership gifted curriculum/programme in South Korea. Each chapter will be dedicated to addressing one or more of the research questions (Refer to Table 1.1 below).

Chapter	No.	Research Questions
1		<i>Statement of research questions</i>
2	(a)	What are the perspectives of, and the relationship between, the main research topics of giftedness and leadership in this research? Do cultural differences influence these perspectives?
3 (Questionnaire & Interviews)	(b)	What is the current situation of gifted education in South Korea?
	(c)	How do teachers understand the relationship between giftedness and leadership and is there a demand for leadership education in gifted students?
	(d)	What do the teachers understand the necessary components and characteristics of leadership gifted curricula to be?
	(e)	How adequate are the available leadership gifted curricula and programmes for the Korean gifted educational context?
4	(f)	What is the emerging conclusive suggestive model from the analysis of the results, current leadership gifted curricula programmes and theoretical leadership gifted research?
5	(g)	How are the suggested components of the model supported by research in each of the components?
6	(h)	How is the suggested model to be implemented?

Table 1.1: Statements of Research Questions

Chapter Two aims to answer the research question: (a) *What are the perspectives of, and the relationship between, the main research topics of giftedness and leadership in this research? Do cultural differences influence these perspectives?* In order to address this question, an overview of the relevant literature pertaining to this study is presented; this overview is separated into four areas of literature review: giftedness, leadership, giftedness and leadership, leadership gifted curricula and programmes, with a special focus on cultural issues. In reviewing the literature in these areas, the need for a comprehensive leadership gifted curriculum or programme can be identified. By examining the theoretical grounds, current state, and cultural, political, and historical backgrounds of Korean gifted education, it is possible

to make suggestions for an ideal leadership gifted curriculum and programme that are circumspectly tailored for the Korean gifted primary student. The theoretical foundations expounded in this chapter marshals the interpretation of the survey of teachers' views presented in Chapter 3.

Chapter 3 discusses the methodology used in this study and aims to explore four main research questions in the investigation of the views of 50 Korean gifted primary school teachers:

- (b) *What is the current situation of leadership gifted education in South Korea?*
- (c) *How do teachers understand the relationship between giftedness and leadership and is there a demand for leadership education in gifted students.*
- (d) *What do the teachers understand the necessary components and characteristics of leadership gifted curricula to be?*
- (e) *How adequate are the available leadership gifted curricula and programmes for the Korean gifted educational context?*

The teachers will be asked on Korean leadership and gifted education, and their opinions on the current operations of leadership and gifted education in their schools. Chapter 3 analyses these views and the suggestions made by the teachers for leadership cultivation in gifted students. Various weaknesses of current gifted and leadership education is explored, dealing with concerns such as most of the gifted curricula in Korean being merely knowledge-based (Refer to Chapter 3, Table 3.5). Jun (2000, p. 167) further elucidates that the current Korean gifted education system instils in its students a yearning for only intellectual acquisition, and does not cater for the social and moral development of their students. Hence, this thesis aims to focus on those absent facets of Korean gifted education that have been assayed through data collection, namely self, social, moral, and leadership development in gifted students.

Chapter 4 deals with the research question: (e) *What is the emerging conclusive suggestive model from the analysis of the results, current leadership gifted curricula/programmes and theoretical leadership gifted research?* The theoretical bases for the formation of a model curriculum and programme which is examined in three sections: firstly, the results of the questionnaires and the interviews; secondly, the theoretical background of leadership gifted curricula and programmes; and finally, the theoretical framework of this model which adapts and adopts the form of Parker's (1983) Leadership Training Model. A new paradigm will be formulated for the foundation of a new leadership gifted curriculum and programme, and

various areas of leadership model's contents will be investigated. This paradigm will be further compared and contrasted to Parker's (1983) model.

Chapter 5 investigates the research question: (f) *How are the suggested components of the model supported by research in each of the components?* This chapter describes the four areas of development for leadership: self, social, moral, and leadership development. Each section of this chapter will emphasise the importance of each of the four areas that are necessary in cultivating leadership skills in the gifted.

Chapter 6 examines the research question: (h) *How is the model to be implemented?* In this chapter, the foundation and importance of gifted curricula and programmes in an international setting will be introduced. Cultural issues will be taken into account in the implementation of the model; in doing so, Renzulli's (1976, 1986) Enrichment Triad Model will be illustrated as a prospective framework of implementing the suggested model as a programme in Korean gifted education.

The final chapter will synthesise the main conclusive suggestions for the formation and implementation of a model leadership gifted curriculum/programme for Korean gifted primary school students; thereby answering the final research question: (i) *What are the conclusive suggestions that can be made from this research for the formulation and implementation of a model leadership gifted curriculum/programme in the Korean educational context?*

In overview, this thesis will aim to assist Korean leadership gifted primary school students in developing leadership. The ultimate goal of leadership gifted education is for the gifted students to comprehend the importance of leadership, recognise their (latent) leadership ability, gain knowledge and skills necessary for them to become effective leaders (Park, 2007). However, the current situation of Korean gifted education in the advent of the 21st century is that of incapacity in identifying the leadership gifted and that of an absence of enquiry into the shortcomings of the current Korean gifted education provisions for leadership development and the subsequent lack of proclivity to emend and improve the gifted educational system (Jin & Cha, 2004, p. 122). The present state of Korean gifted education is far from realising a leadership development programme into practice. Consequently, it is necessary to develop a leadership gifted education programme and to provide a systematic education programme for training and education of various areas of gifted students' leadership.

This thesis endeavours to contribute to Korean gifted education by serving as an impetus for the development of a leadership gifted curriculum and programme through the suggestions made as a means to this end.

Chapter 2: Literature Review

Chapter 2 aims to provide an overview of the topics that are central to this research. The topics that are discussed are giftedness and leadership, and their relationship is explored in the sub-chapters labelled ‘giftedness with leadership and ‘leadership gifted curricula’. The Korean perspective on leadership is discussed in Chapter 2.5. This chapter addresses the following research questions:

No.	Research Question	Summary of Answers	Main Sections to Refer to
a)	<i>What are the perspectives of, and the relationship between, the main research topics of giftedness and leadership in this research?</i>	Various definitions of giftedness are explored including the traditional definition by Terman (1918, 1925) which emphasised IQ scores, a wider conception of giftedness including creativity, artistic ability and leadership (Delisle & Galbraith, 2002). Stankowski (1978) identified five definitions of giftedness. Renzulli (1982) argued for giftedness to be ability, creativity and task commitment. Marland (1972) highlighted six main characteristics of giftedness. The definition embraced by the Korean government was also described.	Chapter 2.1.1. (pp. 10-15).
		The relationship between leadership and giftedness was established by the Marland Report (1972) as leadership ability was included as one of the characteristics of giftedness.	Chapter 2.3. (pp. 42-44).
	<i>Do cultural differences influence these perspectives?</i>	Cultural differences in viewing gifted education and leadership education for the gifted is explored; the aim of Western gifted education is for self-fulfilment whereas Eastern gifted education is conducted to create leaders in society.	Chapter 2.5. (pp. 48-52).

2.1. Literature Review I: Giftedness

2.1.1. Definitions and Perspectives of Giftedness

It is critical that the definition of giftedness is firmly established in this thesis as the definition will come to directly shape the identification of the gifted student. Feldhusen, Asher and Hoover (1984) further argued that not only would the ‘right’ definition of giftedness allow appropriate methodology of distinction, it would contribute to the content of the gifted

education programme. The need for a precise definition of giftedness is further stressed when envisaging the consequences of an inaccurately conceptualised definition of giftedness; S. H. Cho (1995) contends this would lead to erroneous identification of a population of students as gifted and subsequently the gifted education offered to such students may prove to be unsuitable and ineffective. However, there is difficulty in providing a concrete definition of giftedness as “descriptions of giftedness are always based on the social values of the time and culture in which they are given” (Freeman, 1979, p. 1); in other words time and culture relative.

The traditional definition of giftedness is simply seen as having a high IQ score (Terman, 1925). When research in gifted education was initiated in the early 1900's, intelligence was narrowly seen as the unique factor of giftedness. Terman (1918, 1925), who was often named the 'Father of Gifted Children' (Stanley, 1978), defined that gifted children were those who fell within the top 1% of the Stanford-Binet intelligence test or similar intelligence tests. He understood giftedness in terms of a limited genetic concept as he believed that the gifted child was one who had a set IQ score of over 140. The fixed, genetic nature of Terman's conception of intelligence and IQ was heavily criticised; Lippman (1922) advocated a more variable conception of IQ as did Bagley (1922) who maintained that IQ could be permanently improved through education.

More recently, the definitions of giftedness have gradually moved away from the unitary IQ score conception to expand in scope so that intellect is no longer the single factor dominating the identification of a child as gifted. For instance, Delisle and Galbraith (2002) define gifted pupils as not only more advanced than their peers in terms of intellect or a specific academic subject, but also in creativity, artistic ability, and leadership ability.

Giftedness is defined in various ways, so much so that Stankowski (1978) devised a classification system for definitions of giftedness to be categorised into five classes. Four of the five categories are used in the process of identification of gifted children. The first definition emphasises excellent achievement in a certain field. In other words, a member of society who continues to demonstrate excellent achievements in a valuable area is termed gifted. However, this definition is limited in its applicability: with this definition only adults who have proved themselves through their contributions to a field can be identified as gifted. It fails to identify those who are developing, or are yet to develop, their potential.

The second definition of giftedness highlights the significance of intelligence tests. Gifted

students can be identified as those with an IQ score above a certain threshold. Terman's (1918) definition is a classic example in identifying the gifted on the basis of IQ.

The third definition of Stankowski (1978) emphasises that a certain fixed ratio of the population of a school or region is gifted. The standard percentage can be based on IQ tests, the grade point average, and the grade in a specific subject area such as mathematics or science. The standard gifted percentage could be as much as the top 15–25% or as little as the top 1–3%. However, in a study conducted by Reis and Renzulli (1982), there were no differences in the quality of projects produced either by the students of the top 5% or the top 15–25% of the students in terms of their school marks or their IQ tests. In this sense, Reis and Renzulli (1982) strongly argue against the identification of gifted students based on their comprising of the top 3–5% of their school year group or IQ scores in order for participation in gifted education programmes.

The fourth definition of gifted students is those who display talents in, or those who excel in arts, music, mathematics, sciences, art, or any other specialist artistic, academic area.

The fifth definition highlights the significance of creativity; high levels of creativity are the main standard of giftedness. However, Torrance (1984) pointed out that some states of America did either not include the test of creativity in the identification of giftedness or clarify that a creativity test could not be a method of identifying giftedness, despite the suggestive goal of all the gifted education programmes being to promote creativity.

Amongst these various definitions of giftedness, S. H. Cho (1995) believed that although many of the definitions have theoretical or academic foundations, the definitions that are most used are dependant upon the values of society, time, culture, the needs of the society from the gifted, and how much provision that the gifted students can be given by the society (p. 5).

Amongst the diverse definitions of giftedness which have been formed and discussed in the recent years, the most prominent and accepted description of gifted children is from the U. S. Commissioner of Education Sidney P. Marland Jr., (1972) in his report to Congress:

Gifted and talented children are those identified by professionally qualified persons who by virtue of outstanding abilities are capable of high performance. These are children who require differentiated educational programmes and/or services beyond

those normally provided by the regular school programme in order to realise their contribution to self and society (P.L. 91-230, Section 806).

Feldhusen and Jarwan (1993) expanded on Marland's (1972) exposition by defining that children capable of high performance include those with demonstrated achievement and/or potential in one or more of the following areas:

- “1. General intellectual ability
2. Specific academic aptitude
3. Creative or productive thinking
4. Leadership ability
5. Visual and performing arts
6. Psychomotor ability” (p. 233)

This U.S. definition is most commonly used in understanding giftedness due to the following reasons:

1. It considers not only general intelligence but also academic fields as well as talent in non-academic fields.
2. It encourages the development of talents in creativity, leadership, and thinking skills.
3. It emphasises the need for differentiated educational programmes and provisions for the gifted.
4. It provides a basis and reasoning for the development of special programmes for the gifted.
5. The aims of gifted programmes are to develop the high potential abilities of the gifted individuals, and to provide society with creative leaders and problem solvers.
6. It is the starting point for the provision of gifted education for underachievers with latent abilities (S. H. Cho, 1995, p. 6).

This definition of giftedness was later amended by the U.S. Congress in 1978 whereby the sixth characteristic of giftedness, 'psychomotor ability', was eliminated. The reason given for this exclusion was that artistic abilities in the final characteristics could be amalgamated under the fifth characteristic of 'visual and performing abilities'. In addition, the U.S. Congress also decided that those who were talented in sports could receive physical fitness training from school sports programmes to further develop their talents and did therefore not require special

gifted education provisions.

This amended definition of giftedness is also credited by the Education Department of the South Korean Government. Article 2, Paragraph 1 of the Korean Act of Gifted Education Promotion in December, 1988 defined that the gifted are those with abilities and thus need special education to develop their innate potential talents. Within this document, it states that high school students with potential in one or more of the following areas qualify as a recipient of gifted education: (1) General intelligence (2) Special academic aptitudes (3) Creative thinking power (4) Artistic talents (5) Physical fitness (6) Special abilities recognised in society.

The difference between the Korean and the U.S. definitions of giftedness is that physical fitness is seen an area for gifted education in Korea, while leadership is the standard of distinction for giftedness in place of physical fitness in the U.S. (2005 Law for the Promotion of Gifted Education, Section 5).

In contrast to the notion of the American and Korean governments in defining giftedness, Joseph Renzulli (1978) criticised the above perspectives on the grounds that they only highlight the gifted child's intellect or aptitude; it disregards the personality of a child.

More recently, the United States Federal Gifted and Talented Education Act (Javits, 1993) defined giftedness as:

Children and youth with outstanding talent perform or show the potential for performing remarkably at high levels of accomplishment when compared with others of their age, experience or environment. These children and youth exhibit high performance capability in intellectual, creative, and/or artistic areas; possess an unusual leadership capacity, or excel in specific academic fields. They require services or activities not ordinarily provided by the schools. . . . Outstanding talents are present in children and youth from all cultural groups, across all economic strata, and in all areas of human endeavour. (United States Department of Education, 1993, p. 26).

This definition of giftedness firmly grasps the notion of multiple areas of giftedness or intelligence. However, Ford (1996) documented that the U.S. government failed to apply this more modern definition of giftedness in educational practice with the focus still being on the

intellectual definition of giftedness (as cited in Valdes, 2003). Renzulli (1978) criticised the use of only intelligence in the identification of giftedness. Renzulli's (1978) perspective on giftedness consisted of the balance of three basic characteristics: "above average ability, high levels of creativity and high levels of task commitment [or motivation]" (Sternberg & Davidson, 1986, p. 53). He specified that a gifted child must be in the top 15% for these three characteristics. Furthermore, the child must be in the top 2% for one of the traits (Sternberg & Davidson, 1986). Overall, Renzulli was sceptical in identifying gifted students merely on the basis of high level of intelligence as he believed that many students with potential abilities would be left unidentified.

However, it can be argued that for some children, it might be impossible to be gifted in all three areas demarcated by Renzulli (1978). For instance, there are many children who have exceptionally high IQ, yet lack a high level of motivation or creativity, who Renzulli would not label as gifted. Hence, it has a narrow applicability for high achieving students (George, 2003). Thus, Renzulli's perspective poses a problem, as children gifted in only one or two of the three characteristics are overlooked due to the fact that they do not meet the full criterion of his giftedness.

Nevertheless, Renzulli (1979) defended his position by indicating the dangers of defining giftedness by a single criterion. He maintained that giftedness could be demonstrated through at least two different means: for instance, a student could be academically gifted as well as creatively or productively gifted. Here, academic giftedness refers to giftedness that can manifest in and can be identified through IQ tests or cognitive ability tests such as the ability to attain high examination scores or the ability to study effectively. Creative or productive giftedness refers to the ability to generate original ideas that are able to influence the wider population. Renzulli (1979) insisted that these two types of definitions of giftedness, which are significant and interactive, facilitate the development of gifted education.

In sum, there does not exist one singly agreed upon definition of giftedness but a multitude of diverse criteria of what constitutes as being gifted. Despite this multiplicity, most definitions share the common that gifted persons are those who demonstrate certain abilities. According to Renzulli (1986) and Sternberg (1985) the central ability amongst other abilities that gifted students possess is intellectual ability. Taylor (1978, 1986, 1988), Gardner (1983), Tannenbaum (1983), Garner (1985, 1991) consider many abilities of social value to be central to giftedness although their views on ability are slightly different from each other (S. H. Cho,

1995). The evolution of the differing definitions of giftedness shows that giftedness is not absolute but relative to society and its times. Some researchers believe that gifted students must be exceptional only in their level of intelligence, whereas some propose that other abilities should also be considered when identifying gifted students.

2.1.2. Characteristics of Gifted Students

Gifted children were traditionally seen in a negative light due to the common assumption that gifted children with high IQs were not well-rounded in terms of their social lives and personal relationships despite their superior abilities and creativity relative to others (K. W. Jun, 2000). This prevalent conjecture propagated the belief that gifted children were emotionally unstable, nervous and too self-assertive with their opinions: characteristics which prove detrimental in social relationships. Other characteristics of the negative stereotype of the gifted included physical weakness and 'reading too much' which led to their sporting of thick-lensed spectacles (Walker, 2002; Winner, 1998). Even as Terman's (1922) was pioneering research on gifted children, gifted children were seen as abnormal.

Hallahan and Kaufmann (1994) classified all the previously negative Western perspectives towards giftedness into nine types. These include views that gifted children are usually middle-classed males who are physically weak, have social inadaptability, a limited number of interests, and emotional instability, to name a few. This pessimistic outlook is very similar to the past Eastern view of gifted students. In the Eastern world, especially in South Korea, people had a negative opinion towards giftedness (K. W. Jun, 2000).

However, this negative concept of giftedness was rejected by Terman (1925) as he challenged the traditional understanding of giftedness in his research. As a result of Terman's research, gifted children were seen to be physically and mentally healthy as well as intelligent. It is because of Terman's influence that the Western world, especially the United States, has an optimistic view towards gifted students as those who are academically, physically and socially able.⁴

The gifted were found to be emotionally and socially apt, and in many ways had better social skills than typical children. Terman's (1947) research demonstrated that students with high intelligence were popular amongst their peers, well adapted, mentally and physically healthy, and more aware of moral issues than typical children (Little, 2001; Walker, 2002; Winner,

1998). However, although Terman's research challenged the traditional stereotypes of the gifted, it may have portrayed an inaccurate image of all gifted children being content and well-adapted (Little, 2001; Walker, 2002; Winner, 1998; Clack, 1997). In other words, all gifted children may have been characterised as being talented in numerous areas and excelling in all subjects without extra attention, when this is not universally the case.

However, Terman's more positive view of gifted students is supported by other researchers K. W. Jun (2000) identifies the following traits of gifted children:

They have a high level of IQ, can learn more and quickly than others, have excellent memory, have large vocabularies, are creative, can make detailed observations, are often inquisitive and ask many questions, always reveal their giftedness, are more emotionally stable, are organised, confident, very verbal, have low tolerance for slower students, are perfectionists, working harder than average (p. 151).

In addition, some Korean researchers (Kim, Cho, Yoon & Jin, 2004) investigated the characteristics of Korean gifted junior high school students. They concluded that gifted students demonstrated more creative ability, more patience, stronger self-assurance, more imagination and were more inquisitive than non-gifted students. In the future, these qualities can be used to combat any negative concepts or labelling in gifted children.

2.1.3. Contextual Background of Gifted Education in South Korea

The Korean school system is a 'ladder system', comprising of six years in primary school, three years in middle school, and three years in high school followed by four years in university if one chooses to attend it. There are also two or three years in junior colleges as an alternative to universities. Korean National and state primary schools are free and primary school education is compulsory; hence, the current enrolment rate is 99.9% of the primary school aged population (National Institute for International Education Development [NIIED], 2005). In the past, classes in primary schools were consequently overcrowded and excessive in size in their attempt to accommodate for all the primary school students. The overcrowding problem led the government to charge educational tax in 1982 in order to improve the situations in schools. As a result of the governmental financial support, it was found that in 1998, the average class dropped to 34.8 pupils per class. Before governmental tax, 'double shift classes' had been

formed for the early primary school students due to the vast number of pupils; double shift classes refer to splitting the class into two groups, and taking one group in a morning session and the second class in the afternoon in order to reduce overcrowding. However, after the extra funding, most of the crowded classes have disappeared and the educational situation in Korea has significantly improved.

Middle schooling and high schooling in Korea is again free and compulsory. The education offered to students becomes progressively more specialised as the students progress through middle and high school. For instance, high schools are classified into general, vocational and other high schools such as foreign language, art, physical education and science oriented high schools. Thus, students are allowed to enter the high school of their choice according to the subject that they would like to choose for their university courses.

For most countries in the world, gifted education began in the 1970s when governmental research for the promotion of gifted education commenced. Paralleling this trend, since the late 1970's in Korea, the Korean Institute of Behavioural Science and Korean Institute of Education Development began research into gifted education. The government recognised the necessity to develop gifted students in pace with the rapid development of gifted students in other countries. Due to this sudden interest in gifted education, schemes such as acceleration or grade skipping and early entrance to primary schools were put into place. Although Korean gifted education was in its incipient stages, during which schools for gifted students with artistic and physical abilities were being established and experimental schools for gifted students of science were being founded, it marked a nascent period when gifted education was a central topic of interest (D. H. Lee, 1998). However, Korean gifted education faces strong opposition from parents of typical students. The background of Korean gifted education will be approached in terms of the cultural, political and historical background.

a. Cultural Background

The general Korean misconception is while it is believed that special needs education is essential, gifted education is seen as an optional luxury or "bourgeois education" (S. H. Cho, 2002b, p. 29). Nevertheless, Korean parents of typical students fear that their children might be disadvantaged in their entrance into higher education if they do not receive gifted education. Such parental beliefs are evidenced in the lengths that a Local Education Department took to mitigate parental dissension by requesting some newspapers, which wanted to document the

new implementation of gifted science classes, not to term the classes as 'gifted' but as 'science classes' or 'invention classes' for fear of parental contempt. Thus, it is evident that rather than to focus on developing the skills of gifted children, the government is more apprehensive of the censure from the parents of the majority of the students who are not gifted (K. W. Jun, 2000, p. 47). Furthermore, in Eastern cultures, parents hold the erroneous belief that "most of their children have gifted potential" (Freeman, 2004, p. 41). This assumption has led numerous Korean parents to make excessive attempts in furthering the ability of their children through private tuition, which tend to be very expensive, to increase the chances of their children in entering gifted schools.

Parents of typical children attest the need for equality in education and reject the concept of gifted education as they believe that gifted education introduces an inequality in education that would disadvantage their children. Overall, it is very difficult to introduce gifted education in South Korea because of the traditional ethos for equality, democracy and conformity underlying the social and cultural attitudes towards gifted education, which may explain for the underdevelopment of gifted education in Korea.

b. Political Background

Two egalitarian educational policies were introduced in 1969 and 1972, which recommended that middle school students and high school students respectively should be given equal education, with no reference to individual students' ability levels. This led to a marked decline the performance of students in school. From thence, students were differentiated into classes that were appropriate to their abilities and interests. This highlighted the necessity of gifted education in Korea (D. H. Lee, 1998).

Due to the previous egalitarian policies of South Korea, the level of creativity, comprehension and achievement of the students had decreased all students received the same uniform education regardless of their level of achievement, motivation or creativity. However, we are led to ask, 'Is true egalitarianism uniformity?' According to the 29th Article of the Constitutional Law of South Korea, "all citizens have the right to receive an equal education according to their ability" (K. W. Jun, 2000, p. 40). This asserts that the ability level of students should determine the education that they receive. In this light, true educational equality is achieved by matching each student's education to their individual level of ability, rather than through the imposition of uniform education. K. W. Jun (2000) writes that the true meaning of egalitarian education is

the provision of education that takes into account, and caters for, the ability levels and needs of its students.

Despite ardent cultural and political opposition to the provision of gifted education, the South Korean government expanded the field of gifted education and created the Korean Education Development Institute (KEDI) and (in a public show of importance of education in Korea) promoted the Education Cabinet Minister to the position of Vice-President of Korea (J. I. Yoon, 2002). However, as gifted education in Korea was being developed, the Korean economic crisis in 1997 otherwise known as the International Monetary Fund (IMF) crisis, brought about unforeseen changes in the national educational policies. The economic crisis was followed by the adoption of the economic policy of neo-liberalism which directly shaped the national educational policies.

Neo-liberalism espoused the stance that the Korean governmental educational system was inefficient. The neo-liberalism movement advanced the importance of the market system as a means of fulfilling the needs of each person. This promoted freedom and diversity in choices within education, which led to the established of a market of schools where freedom was offered in replacement of equality. Education became a commodity, which increased the competition between schools to attract students to their school. Therefrom, the economic principles of marketing were applied to education; the teachers became the product and students became the client, making the market a client-based arena. In order to extend the period of the time the clients spend in the 'markets', there have been developments in life-long learning and founding of many schools, providing the students or customers choices within education.

Recently, many types of schools were established to provide students with an educational market. The main ones are the state schools, self-funded private schools, gifted education schools, and alternative schools. Although these choices provide people a diversity of schools to match diverse needs and desires, in this situation, gifted education developed as an expansion of the education market. In particular, after the formation of the Gifted Education Promotion Law (March, 2002), there was a sudden increase in the provision of gifted education.

c. Historical Background

Korean awareness of the need for gifted education began in the late 1970's, although it was not until the 1980's when gifted education provision started with the establishment of the first

science high school in 1983. The announcement of the Presidential Commission for Educational Reform in 1995, wherein the promotion of gifted education was recommended, prompted a rapid development of gifted education in Korea. By the following year, many policies had been introduced, such as for acceleration, and for appointing and supporting Korean gifted education research centres. As a result of the significant progress made in Korean gifted education in 1996, 2000 witnessed the promulgation of the Law for the Promotion of Gifted Education and this law was finally implemented in 2002 when the government financially supported giftedness research and gifted institutions. The new legislation introduced in the 21 century further facilitated the development of gifted education by fostering more interest in giftedness (H. E. Suh, 2003).

In 2004, the Ministry of Education and Human Resources Development (MOEHRD) announced new policies on the development of gifted education. These new policies specified the direction that gifted education was to be developed: both in quantity and the quality, and affected the implementation of gifted education in gifted education institutions as well as mainstream schools (S. H. Cho, 2005). The effect of increased research and interest in the field of gifted education is evidenced in the growth in the number of educational institutions for the gifted as well as the increase in the number of students identified as gifted for entry into for the gifted institutions every year since 2002.

2.1.4. Gifted Education Institutions in South Korea

In Korea, educational institutions for the gifted consist of three types of scholastic bodies: specialised gifted schools for the gifted, Centres for the Gifted, and special classes for the gifted in mainstream schools (refer to Appendix I; S. H. Cho, 2005). Firstly, specialised gifted schools are high schools that have been specifically established for the gifted. These schools employ both ordinary teachers and those demonstrating specialist knowledge in a particular subject to teach challenging curricula and programmes to their gifted student population.

Secondly, Centres for the Gifted are centres that operate outside scholastic hours, that is, after school, during the weekends, and during school vacations. Centres for the Gifted are coordinated and directed by two organisations: either a university, or the metropolitan/provincial school board. Both types of centres offer advanced gifted lessons in the two specialist subjects of science or mathematics to both primary and middle school students. In the centre organised by universities, the academic staff of the university are directly teach the

gifted students. In the centres organised by school boards, gifted teachers are employed to teach the students. Gifted teachers are trained by KEDI with an obligatory 60-120 hours of training. The centres organised by school boards have an entry requirement of living in a particular area.

Lastly, some mainstream schools provide gifted classes outside or within school hours. A mainstream school may choose to offer gifted education to its students independently, or join with other mainstream schools in the vicinity and provide gifted education to an amalgamated gifted group. Like in the Centres for the Gifted that are operated within school boards, trained gifted teachers organise and teach gifted education.

Gifted Students in Gifted Educational Institutions

According to a source from the MOEHRD in 2005, 9,956 students are currently participating in 291 gifted classes in mainstream schools in Korea, as of April, 2005, and 17,827 students are attending 264 Centres for the Gifted (refer to Appendix II). In total, from 2004, the number of gifted students in primary, middle and high school increased by 43.3% in 2005.

32.2% of the gifted students attended gifted classes in mainstream schools, 57.6% attended Centres for the Gifted run by school boards and 10.2% attended Centres for the Gifted run by universities. In other words, Centres for the Gifted run by school boards is the most prevalent choice of institution for receiving gifted education in South Korea. The percentage of gifted students by the total number of students are 0.36% (primary schools), 0.78% (middle schools), and 0.09% (high schools). The average percentage of gifted students compared to the total student population is 0.39%. This percentage is very small in comparison to 1-15% of other countries, but is gradually increasing in trend (MOEHRD, 2005).

Korean gifted education is concentrated in the areas of mathematics and sciences. 82.7% of current gifted education is in the sciences, especially mathematics (S. H. Cho, 2005). Although the number of gifted institutes is multiplying, there is a lack of institutes which provide a high quality of education with standardised and organised curricula. Due to the development of gifted education in largely only the knowledge-based subjects of sciences and mathematics, there is a growing voice of protest in Korea at present.⁵

2.1.5. Methods of Identification of Gifted Students

There are numerous methods of identification used to assess giftedness. The assessment methods can be broadly divided into two types: test-based assessment by using test tools and teacher-based assessment by teachers' observations or nominations (J. S. Lee, 1996). There are also various ways of implementing the tests; some tests can either be individually or collectively administered (individual vs. group testing) and a test could be used as the single determiner of giftedness or be concurrently used with many others to identify giftedness (single-testing vs. multiply-testing).

a. Individual vs. Group Testing

Group testing describes the simultaneous testing of many individuals at the same place, whilst individual testing involves one-by-one testing of each student (J. S. Lee, 1996). The advantage of group assessments over individual testing is the relative ease in administration and improved time-, resource-, and cost-effectiveness (J. S. Lee, 1996). However, group testing suffers the drawback of lower reliability and validity relative to individual testing (Davis & Rimm, 2001). For instance, a possible threat to the validity of group testing could arise from the relatively fixed nature of the speed at which group assessments are worked through (Davis & Rimm, 2001). Due to the restraints of group testing, Silverman (1986) believed that group assessments should be used as preliminary "rough screening devices" to "find out what the potential pool is and then use an individual test for final selection" (p. 170).

b. Single vs. Multiply Testing

Single testing and multiply testing differ in the number and consequently the range of assessments that are used to identify the gifted (S. H. Cho, 2005). As with individual testing, single testing is more time-, resource-, and cost-effective than multiply testing, but simultaneously suffers from the risk of lower reliability and validity compared to the amalgam of multiple assessments used in multiply testing. This is because in applying an assessment to giftedness identification, it is assumed that the entity or entities measured by the assessment pertain to giftedness. However, as discussed above, the concept of giftedness is not defined on a single dimension, but its definition is multi-dimensional. Therefore, if single testing is carried out with an instrument that does not comprehensively assess every potential expression of giftedness, as based on an accepted definition of giftedness, it is argued that single testing will be both insufficient in the identification of the gifted and relatively lacking in validity when

compared to multiply testing.

Therefore, when choosing the form of administering and applying giftedness assessments, the trade-off between cost-effectiveness, and its effects on the reliability and validity of the assessments should be taken into account.

c. Test-based vs. Teacher-based Assessment

Test-based Assessments

Test-based assessments consist of standardized tests that index intelligence, achievement, and creativity, and tests of scholastic ability and interest areas (S. H. Cho, 2005; C. H. Kim, 1998; J. S. Lee, 1996).

Intelligence Tests

The most frequently used test of giftedness among standardized tests is intelligence tests for an individual or a group (J. S. Lee, 1996). The most universally widely used intelligence tests are tabulated in Table 2.1.

<p>Stanford-Binet Intelligence Scale</p>	<p>This test includes both verbal and non-verbal measures and is currently in its fourth revision, the Stanford-Binet Intelligence Scale, fifth edition (SB V). It is the most universally widely used intelligence test and is appropriate for children from the age of 2;0 and above. The SB V is largely untimed and computes the individual’s full scale IQ, and verbal and non-verbal IQs on five factors: Fluid Reasoning, Knowledge, Quantitative Reasoning, Visual-Spatial Processing, and Working Memory.⁶ The IQ scores are calculated by measuring their relative position in a normal distribution of individuals who are of the same age. The SB tests produce a “single deviation IQ standard score that is comparable form one age level to another” (Feldhusen & Jarwan, 1993, p. 242).</p>
<p>Wechsler Tests</p>	<p>The Wechsler tests contain both verbal and performance tests of intelligence. WPPSI is used for 2;6 to 7;3 year olds and is</p>

<p>(Wechsler Preschool and Primary Scale of Intelligence [WPPSI]) and the Wechsler Intelligence Scale for Children [WISC])</p>	<p>currently in its second revised form, the third edition, WPPSI-III. The WISC is aimed at 6;0 to 16;11 year old children and is currently in its third revised form, the fourth edition, WISC-IV. The WISC-IV computes a full scale IQ score and scores on four indexes as a measure of intelligence. The four indexes are the Verbal Comprehension Index, Perceptual Organization Index, Freedom from Distractibility Index, and the Processing Speed Index. The Wechsler tests are the most widely used in the U.S. The WISC has been adapted for the Korean context by the KEDI to form the KEDI-WISE, and is the most widely used intelligence test in Korea.</p>
<p>Raven's Progressive Matrices (RPM)</p>	<p>The RPM measures analogical reasoning ability (considered by some to be central to intelligence such as Sternberg, 1977) in children from the age of 5;0 to adults. Three versions of the test currently exist: the Standard, Coloured and Advanced RPM. This test has no time limits and contains items which are ordered to become progressively more difficult to solve. The advantages of the test include its relative independence of verbal ability and culture.</p>

Table 2.1: Popular Intelligence Tests (Framework from J. G. Lee, 2002, pp. 65-66).

Intelligence tests can be separated into verbal tests and non-verbal or performance tests. Verbal tests are believed to be better predictors of academic success than non-verbal tests as our academic education and assessment mostly involve verbal communication (H. M. Lee, 2002). The advantage of intelligence tests is that they can be easily used due to their capacity to be conducted in any setting. However, intelligence tests suffer from many disadvantages such as the verbal nature of some of its components making it impracticable to test those who with reading difficulties (J. S. Lee, 1996). Another major disadvantage is the difficulty in precisely identifying the IQ scores of the exceptionally intelligent as some intelligence tests have low ceilings and high floors and are aimed at average ranges of intelligence scores. However, newer revisions of intelligence tests have since combated these limitations.

This can be seen with the revisions of the Stanford-Binet Intelligence Scales. Firstly, in relation to the difficulties arising from tests' verbal nature, the latest edition, SB V is the first in the series which allows nonverbal testing of all five factors involved (Smith, n.d.). Secondly,

in reference to the low ceilings and high floors of intelligence tests, the SB V, relative to its earlier edition SB IV, has raised ceilings and lowered floors and is consequently more appropriate in identifying those lying in the extreme ends of the IQ spectrum. Prior to the advent of SB V, SB IV was not recommended in the testing of those with exceptional intelligence or extreme mental retardation due to its suitability to the 90% of the population who had IQ scores between the 50 to 148 points (3 Standard Deviations; Silverman, 1986). This was because Thorndike (1927), a senior author of the SB IV, believed that as there was only a minority of gifted individuals with an IQ score of more than 148. Thus, many researchers recommended the use of SB form L-M in identifying the highly intelligent, despite the fact that it had been normed at an earlier date than the SB IV. However, the latest revision has successfully overcome the major limitation of its earlier edition.

The convenience and continuing refinement of intelligence tests have led to their title as the most popular tool used in identifying the gifted (J. G. Lee, 2002). However, it must be noted that high intelligence is not the only component of giftedness. Intelligence tests must be used in tandem with other methods of assessment in order to assess the many different aspects of giftedness.

Achievement Tests

Achievement tests attempt to measure how much students have learned in a particular subject area over a period of time. The numerous types of achievement tests have a national standardised method of being marked. Some examples of currently used achievement tests include the Metropolitan Achievement Test, Sequential Tests of Educational Progress, Screening Assessment for Gifted Elementary Students, Wide Range Achievement Test, and Peabody Individual Achievement Test (Feldhusen & Jarwan, 2000).

The results of the achievement tests may be used to aid teachers in the identification of gifted children in their classes. However, Davis and Rimm (2001) warned of the dangers of achievement tests being too easy leading to many children scoring highest marks. In order to prevent ceiling effects and to differentiate between the high test scoring individuals, the achievement tests could be extended to include more complex items appropriate for older year groups so that identification of the gifted can be assisted.

Creativity Tests

Urban and Jellen (1988) defined creativity as the ability to create something unique and unforeseen by perceiving and utilising maximum information (as cited in George, 2003). However, a single precise and agreed upon definition of creativity does not exist; this lack is conveyed in Klein's (1982) statement that "creativity is an extremely difficult concept to define and subsequently to measure" (as cited in George, 1992, p. 42). Therefore, creativity remains a relatively ambiguous concept. Due to the uncertainty surrounding the concept of creativity, creativity tests are seen as a secondary type of assessment for giftedness.

An example creativity test is the Torrance Test which is a type of thinking skills test. Tests such as *PRIDE* (Preschool and Primary Interest Descriptor), *GIFT* (Group Inventory for Finding [Creative] Talent), *GIFFI* (Group Inventory for Finding Interests) *I and II* tests personality traits (Davis & Rimm, 2001). *PRIDE* (Rimm, 1982) is a list-based test used for children prior to entering school, during preschool or reception ages. *GIFT* is used for primary school students whereas *GIFFI I* is for middle school students and *GIFFI II* is for high school students. An advantage of creativity tests is that it can identify highly creative students who may not have been identified as gifted from an average performance in an intelligence test. However, a shortcoming of creativity tests is that many are limited in number of creativity fields that are assessed (Gallagher, 1966).

Scholastic Ability and Interest Tests

In addition to the standardized tests used in the identification of giftedness, scholastic ability tests and interest tests are used. In Korea, scholastic ability tests are more commonly and readily used than others due to its convenience in directly using students' school grades as a measure of giftedness. However, a weakness of this test is its inability in identifying underachieving gifted children as their grades will not document their giftedness (J. S. Lee, 1996; S. H. Cho, 2002a).

Interest tests are significant in understanding and identifying gifted students. Most students are motivated when they participate in activities they are interested in. Such interests should be noted when educating students as their interests may stem from their abilities (J. S. Lee, 1996).

Evaluation of Test-based Testing

In sum, many types of tests for the identification of gifted students exist, with each measuring some aspects of giftedness. These tests provide quick, concrete and clear evidence that can be used to objectively determine whether a student is gifted or not. Furthermore, the standardized tests are high in reliability and validity due to their numerous revisions and improvements.

However, the disadvantages of test-based assessment of giftedness is that as children develop, their needs will change and therefore must be repeatedly tested for any change in their giftedness, which is time consuming, effortful and expensive. Vernon, Adams, & Vernon (1977) suggested taking tests every two years to keep up with the participants' developments (Denton & Postlethwaite, 1985). Secondly, Freeman (1979) saw that environmental and cultural factors might hinder the participant from fully demonstrating his potential in the performance in a test. Thirdly, tests which only measure achievement or scholastic ability only consider the amount of knowledge accrued by the student rather than measuring giftedness. Hence, other types of assessments must be conducted in conjunction with IQ testing as other characteristics and abilities must also be tested to effectively identify giftedness. However, conducting a range of test will involve more time, effort and money.

Vernon et al. (1977) stated that the aim of the tests was to "use them as one diagnostic tool or as apart of an initial screening procedure" (Denton & Postlethwaite, 1981, p. 51). In this respect, the test-based method should be used in the initial stages of assessing a child for giftedness, similar to Renzulli's (1986) first stage of assessment of gifted children through an IQ test. This initial testing would provide concrete evidence of the participants' abilities which could be further supplemented by teacher-based assessments, a category of assessment which is introduced below.

b. Teacher-based Assessment

In addition to test-based assessments, teacher-based assessments such as teacher nominations and observations are also used to identify gifted students. Observation can be conducted not only by teachers but also by parents, professional educational psychologists and friends. Teacher nominations and observations are frequently used worldwide in identifying the gifted (H. M. Lee, 2002). George (2003) considered teacher nomination to be an important method

of identification as teachers are usually first to notice the child's giftedness. Thus, numerous screening programmes for the identification of the gifted heavily rely on teacher nominations or referrals (George, 2003). These methods of identification particularly appropriate for identifying the behavioural traits of the giftedness, in students whose giftedness is not immediately obvious (Sanborn, 1977).

Teacher Nominations

A formal and objective approach to teacher nominations of gifted students can be taken, firstly with the teachers being formally trained in giftedness identification, and secondly, through the use of checklists that catalogue typical characteristics gifted students. A more informal and subjective approach to teacher nomination is to identify gifted children through informal observations based on opinion rather than guidelines given in formal training.

Tannenbaum (1983) recommended the adoption of the formal approach though his assertion that teachers should be given the training to formally identify the gifted for effective giftedness identification. This training is necessary because teachers can easily lose objectivity in judgement and become biased, for instance by favouring a child who is neat, wealthy, kind or obedient (Hetch, 1977). At times, academic achievements or high enthusiasm for academia can also be confounded with intelligence and inaccurately used to judge students as being gifted (Tuttle & Becker, 1975). The formal approach to teacher nomination is more so recommended for the Korean setting where discontented parents of typical students will likely demand to know the basis of the teachers' nominations.

Recommendations may also be made by professionals, parents and peers of the gifted child. Parents play an important role in identifying the abilities and the talents of the gifted (Bloom, 1981; Sisk, 1987). However, this is not recommended in Korea due to the widespread erroneous belief aforementioned as being held by the majority of Korean parents that their children are gifted. Peer nomination is not frequently used but it is considered to be valuable as peers may be more aware than teacher of a student's behaviours outside of school (Brandwein, 1981; Tannenbaum, 1985).

Checklists

Checklists that indicate the specific characteristics of giftedness differ for different cultures and

regions throughout the world. Freeman (2000) saw that checklists “rather than being specific to aptitudes, may be socio-cultural.” For instance, in the United States, greater awareness of morality and leadership skills are very much linked to giftedness, which is reflected in their checklists for identifying the gifted. However, Rothmann (1992) argued that moral reasoning could not be explained by IQ.

Nevertheless, Freeman (2000) believed that the advantage in the use of checklists was that it would “stimulate teachers to think about the identification of the very able” (p. 12). On the other hand, a disadvantage is that gifted children may not be identified if they do not “fit with the opinions of those who devise the lists” (Freeman, 2000, p. 12).

Evaluation of Teacher-based Assessment

Denton and Postlethwaite (1985) researched the effectiveness of the teacher-based approach compared to the test-based approach in identifying gifted students through the Oxford Research Programme (1985). They chose the top 10% of 13 to 14 year olds who did well in French, Mathematics, English Literature and Physics. As well as testing the students in these subjects, the teachers were also given the task to identify who they believed were gifted in their classes. The objective of the experiment was to discover if the teachers’ opinions corresponded with the students’ scores. It was concluded:

“[The] teachers were found to be more accurate at identifying pupils of high ability in a subject-specific way than the work of previous researchers who were concerned with identification of general (IQ-based) ability had suggested” (Denton & Postlethwaite, 1981, p. 67).

The research was known for its results in that there was a high correlation between the teachers’ nominations and the test students’ performance in French and Mathematics. However, for English Literature and Physics, there were “enough mismatches between the teacher and test-based assessments to show errors of judgement by teachers” (George, 2003, pp. 23-24).

However, Freeman maintained the positive correlation between teacher-based recommendations and test-based assessments by pointing out some factors which could account for the contradictory results. She observed that the checklists given to the teachers were twenty-two pages long, which could discourage research participation. Secondly, the study did not use

objective data in that class assessments were used instead of standardized assessments such as GCSE's. Finally, she suggested that the inaccuracies in the teacher's nominations could be inflated by the fact that the research was conducted at the start of the academic year when the teachers were unfamiliar with the children (Freeman, 1998).

Hence, if these extraneous factors were controlled for, Freeman (1998) argued that the identification of gifted students would be more or less the same whether identified using standardized tests or through teacher nomination.

In sum, the teacher-based assessment is preferred by many researchers, including the author as it involves a personal relationship between the student and the teacher which may yield more information about the giftedness of a child than through a test. Also, teacher-based assessments are useful because intelligence tests do not assess all the talents and abilities that a gifted individual may possess.

Despite the advantages of observations and the teacher-student interactions characterizing teacher-observations, there are practical factors to consider. Some teachers might only focus on their favourite pupils or they might show bias towards some students due to their gender, ethnic group, and social standing. In reality, many schools are made up of large classes which will limit the teachers in their observations and interactions with the students. Furthermore, the teachers may only consider children as students in the school and may relate to them solely through schoolwork and their behaviour in class. Teachers may not be aware of their students' behaviours and feelings outside the scholastic settings.

Identification of Gifted Students in South Korea

In Korea, there are various problems occurring regarding the identification of gifted students. Firstly, there is confusion as to which method of assessment to use, as a result of different methods being proposed by individual research centres and institutions. In order to successfully develop the gifted student through education, an accurate form of assessment is essential. Secondly, due to the aforementioned antagonism that gifted education has been met with since its conception in Korea, several identification schemes, along with systematic and organized education of gifted children have proved unsuccessful.

Therefore, the most prevalent method of identifying gifted students was the test-based approach,

and to further specify, the use of standardized intelligence testing in a single testing format. This was due to convenience and the quick provision of objective evidence for giftedness (K. W. Jun, 2000). However, there is a danger in solely using an intelligence test in the identification process of the gifted due to the narrow and anachronous definition of giftedness that underlies the application of an intelligence test in such a process. For instance, using one-stage intelligence tests in identifying the gifted could lead to the exclusion of students with exceptional leadership abilities and individuals gifted in performing and visual arts; hence, there may be a trade-off between convenience and accuracy in identification when using intelligence tests as the sole identification tool of the gifted. Moreover, in Korea, as gifted students were mainly selected on the basis of their intelligence test results and academic performance, many parents place their children in private tuition in order to help their children enter a gifted programme (Go, 2003). In this respect, the difficulty in giftedness identification has effected a major social problem in Korea.

However, in 2002, the Korean International Gifted Children Research Centre proposed a set of principles for formulating methods of assessment (S. H. Cho, 2002b):

1. Various tests must be used in the identification of students. For instance, parental and teacher observations of the children are essential as well as going through standardized testing.
2. Methods of assessment for giftedness must change according to the age of the child. They also must be administered frequently as it is commonly believed that giftedness is not permanently endowed.
3. Assessment for giftedness and its aims should be consistent with the type of gifted education that the students will be receiving.

From these principles, a four-stage process of giftedness assessment was developed, promoted and is currently aimed for (refer to Figure 2.1). The first stage is the recommendation of a parent or a teacher which takes into account school reports and a range of academic and personal achievements. The second stage involves standardised tests such as intelligence assessments or tests for creativity, interest areas, and exceptional ability in special subject areas. The third and fourth stage involve observation: the third stage requires observation by parents, teachers, professionals, or peers for exceptional skills in a specific area such as problem solving or information processing. The fourth stage involves placing the child into a special educational setting and observing their adjustment and management in the new learning environment by the

teacher. With the final observation, a decision is made as to whether the child will remain in the new setting or be returned to mainstream education (S. H. Cho, 2005).

Although not all current gifted identification methods adhere to the recommended four-stage process of identification, there is a gradual change in the assessment methods used towards multiply-testing and using both test-based and teacher-based assessment.

Future Improvements to Gifted Identification in Korea

The participating teachers involved in the assessment of gifted students should be trained in the methods of identifying gifted children (Tannenbaum, 1983). There also should be a standardised process to objectivise teachers' opinions into formal evidence for giftedness, such as through the use of checklists. More interaction between children and teachers should be encouraged outside the school environment so that there is more personal knowledge of the children. In Western societies parent-teacher meetings are held for this purpose. However, in




Figure 2.1: The Four-stage Process of Giftedness Assessment Recommended in Korea (S. H. Cho, 2005).

South Korea, there is a further interaction through teacher-visits to the homes of their students at the start of every academic year. The teacher talks about the children to their parents and becomes more familiar with the student and his or her familial background outside the confines of the school. The personal knowledge of the pupils by the teachers may be improved by the formation of portfolios (Black, 1998) whereby the teachers collect all evidence of observation and interaction with the children. Portfolios would document everything about the student, including their personality, interests, and academic work through audio tapes, video tapes, and written materials. Through this, the student could be assessed more holistically, as opposed to countless series of tests, observations and interviews in the selection of gifted children. However, in order to materialise this ambition, the class sizes must be smaller and the teachers should process less administrative work to have more time for teacher-student interaction and

assessment of giftedness

In conclusion, one of the primary objectives of gifted researchers and educators should be to devise a reliable and valid collection of tests appropriate to each society and culture that can be used to comprehensively assess the giftedness of the student.

2.2. Literature Review II: Leadership

2.2.1. Definitions of Leadership

Numerous scholars have been researching and reporting on the notion of leadership for many years. Bogue (1985) believed that leaders were inevitable whenever two or more people got together. Gallagher (1990) identifies the social nature of leadership as, “the exercise of power or influence in social collectives such as groups, organisations, [and] communities to meet the needs to the group” (as cited in Gallagher et al., 1990, p. 8). In sum, leadership involves aiming towards a certain goal and having a social influence on others in order to achieve that goal; this is evidenced in Rost’s (1993) statement that leadership is when leaders and followers intend real changes and there are outcomes which reflect their shared purposes.

Leadership can be described as a process by which one person sets a certain standard and outlines his or her expectations, and influences the actions of others to behave in what is considered a desirable direction. Therefore, leaders are people who can influence the behaviours of others for the purpose of achieving a certain goal (Rodd, 1994). However, Kim and Choi (2005) emphasised that leaders exist for the community of people rather than for the power and influence of the leaders, which is a common misunderstanding due to various understandings of political leaders in societies. Regardless of the specific definition of leadership that is used, any leadership includes three variables: the influencer, the influenced, and objectives, whereby the objectives are the goals of the influencer and the influenced that are to be achieved (C. Y. Chung, 2006).

2.2.2. Characteristics of Leaders

The personal qualities of a future leader are significant for Montgomery (2001) who wrote that leadership is “the capacity and the will to rally men and women in a common purpose, and the character which inspires confidence” (Gardner, 1995, p. 148). This is also the view of Henry

Kissinger (Gardner, 1995), who believed that a “great leader must be an educator, bridging the gap between the vision and the familiar. But, he must also be willing to walk alone to enable his society to follow the path he has selected” (Gardner, 1995, p. 204). In this sense, the typical definitions of leadership are dependent upon the context of one’s own society.

In terms of characteristics of leaders in society, Richardson and Feldhusen (1990) concluded that many leaders tend to be extroverted. However, there are those who are introverted who later in life become leaders. Some research found that introverted people are often very sensitive to subtle social indications (Laney, 2002), which is a quality that many leaders also possess. Laney (2002) acknowledges that introverts may seem “weak” due to their sensitivity, but “introversion actually creates many strengths – including great depth and insight – allowing them to be gifted leaders, speakers, teachers, and visionaries” (p. 30). Some famous leaders who were also introverted, includes Thomas Edison, Bill Gates and Steve Martin, to name a few (Laney, 2002).

One of the main characteristics of leaders is their ability to persuade and lead an individual or a group into a decision so that a difficult problem may be solved. According to Marker (1982), those who possess leadership skills are well-liked by friends, have the ability to mix with other people, are cooperative with teachers and classmates, have a strong sense of responsibility, and are well adapted to new surroundings. Feldhusen & Kennedy (1988) add that successful leaders are also good thinkers.

Throughout the twentieth century, leadership literature generally focused on the trait approach, which was one of the first systematic attempts to research leadership. In the beginning of the twentieth century, leadership traits were investigated to determine what made some people great leaders. They concentrated on identifying the innate qualities and characteristics possessed by great social, political, and military leaders including Mohandas Gandhi, Abraham Lincoln and Napoleon. It was believed that people were born with leadership traits and only certain ‘great’ individuals possessed them. These investigations concentrated on determining the specific traits that clearly differentiated the leaders from their followers (Bass, 1990; Jago, 1982).

Researchers also started to examine other personality traits such as creativity and self-confidence, physical traits such as age and energy level, abilities such as knowledge and fluency of speech, social characteristics such as popularity and sociability, and work-related characteristics such as the desire to excel and persistence against all obstacles. Effective

leaders were often identified by exceptional performance or achievement, a high status position within an organization or a salary that exceeded that of their peers (Daft, 2002).

Personal Characteristics of Leaders

Richard (2002) suggests that most leaders possess the following personal characteristics (refer to Table 2.2):

Physical Characteristics	Energy, physical stamina.
Intelligence and Ability	Intelligence, cognitive ability, knowledge, judgement, decisiveness.
Personality	Self-confidence, honesty, integrity, enthusiasm, desire to lead, independence.
Social Characteristics	Sociability, interpersonal skills, cooperativeness, ability to enlist, cooperation tact, diplomacy.
Work-related Characteristics	Achievement drive, desire to excel, responsibility in pursuit of goals, persistence against obstacles, tenacity.

Table 2.2: Characteristics of Leaders (Richard, 2002, p. 45)

All in all, the trait approach has its roots in leadership theory that suggested that certain people were born with special traits that made them great leaders. As it was believed that leaders and non-leaders could be differentiated by traits, throughout the twentieth century, researchers were challenged to identify the definitive traits of leaders.

During the mid-twentieth century, several major studies questioned the basic premise that a unique set of traits defined leadership ability in an individual (C. Y. Chung, 2006). As a result, attention was shifted to incorporating the effect of situations and of followers on leadership. Researchers began to study the interactions that occurred between leaders and their context instead of emphasising only the leaders' traits. However, current researches are now once again emphasising the critical traits of leaders (Northouse, 2004). It has been found that some of the most important leadership traits are intelligence, self-confidence, determination, integrity, and sociability (Northouse, 2004). The trait approach puts forward that one must first discover their strengths and weaknesses in order to enhance their leadership skills.

There are several advantages to viewing leadership from the trait approach:

1. It is intuitively appealing because it fits clearly into the popular idea that leaders are special people who are out front, leading the way in society.
2. There is a great deal of research that validates the basis of this perspective.
3. By focusing exclusively on the leader, the trait approach provides an in-depth understanding of the leader component in the leadership process.
4. It has provided some benchmarks against which individuals can evaluate their own personal leadership attributes (Northouse, 2004, p. 32).

On the contrary, the trait approach has failed to delimit a definitive list of leadership traits. In analysing the traits of leaders, the approach has failed to take into account the influence of the situations that they are in. In addition, the approach has resulted in subjective lists of the most important leadership traits, which are not necessarily grounded in strong and reliable research. Furthermore, the trait approach has not adequately linked the traits of leaders with other outcomes such as group and team performance. Lastly, this approach is not particularly useful for the training and development of leadership as it is believed that individuals' personal attributes are relatively stable and fixed, and therefore their traits are not amenable to change.

2.2.3. Development of Leadership Theories

The history of leadership has been characterised by three stages. The first stage is from the 1920s to the 1950s; this stage is characterised by the trait theory which regards leaders as those with particular traits. The second stage is from the 1950s to the 1970s; this stage can be epitomized by behaviour theory which proposed that it is possible to be great leaders by learning the behaviours of great leaders. The third stage began from 1970s until now; this stage can be determined by situational theory, which emphasises that a leader demonstrates different types of behaviour in accordance with various situations. In other words, the leaders' behaviours are dependent on the situational context (Cho, 1997). All in all, leadership theories have been developed and certain aspects of leadership is highlighted in each of them. The next section is a review of the development of leadership theories over the years.

Trait Theory

Trait theory is the oldest theory developed in the 1940s, maintained first by Stogdill (1948).

This theory focuses its study on individual traits of leaders. Examples of such traits are intelligence, decisiveness, extroversion, and judgment. According to this theory, leadership is decided by individual qualities and abilities. In other words, leaders should have more of the 'leadership' traits than ordinary people. The assumption underlying trait theory is effectively summarised in Aristotle's notion that "From the hours of birth, some are marked out for subjugation and others for command" (as cited from Parker & Begnaud, 2004, p. ix).

However, this theory fails to identify unified traits which leaders should have. Moreover, it is not able to suggest the extent of certain qualities that a leader should possess. In addition, the theory fails to identify that there is a cause and effect relationship between leaders' traits and actual leadership. The definitive flaw of trait theory is that the concept of a leader is generalised; Choi and Chung (1980) criticised trait theory by stating that leaders tend to change in reaction to different situations. Trait theory does not essentially consider the time and place, organisation or the character of group in which the leader's leadership is exercised. Thus, situational theory entered the scene later on, to counter the shortcomings of trait theory (Shin et al., 2004).

Behaviour Theory

As trait theory could not be used to effectively identify gifted students, researchers placed more emphasis on the studies of successful leaders' behaviours. They hypothesised that great leaders demonstrate special behaviours. Thus, the theory is based on the assumption that it is possible to be great leaders simply by learning the behaviours of great leaders.

Yulk (1994) described a representative study of leaders' behaviours which was conducted in the University of Ohio. This study was based on the analysis of how much influence a leader's considerate and commanding behaviour had on the members' tasks and the level of satisfaction with their work. Fleisman and Harris (1962) who studied this functional relationship found that as the leader showed more considerate behaviour to the members, the rate of their dissatisfaction and their leaving of jobs became lower, but as the leader heightened commanding behaviour, the rate of group members' dissatisfaction with their and their leaving of jobs escalated. Thus, this research concluded that a useful behaviour to learn from that of successful leaders is consideration in actions as it is more effective and produces more satisfaction in his or her followers.

Situational Theory

Situational theory was pioneered by Fred Fiedler in the 1970s and is presently more widely accepted than trait theory. It proposed that different situations necessitated the leaders' expression of different traits and actions appropriate to the context. Researchers recognised that trait theory or behaviour theory could not explain situational variables which influence leadership processes. Situational theory maintains that the reason why a certain person becomes a leader is not that he or she is born with certain traits, but that he or she is familiar with the situation and shows suitable actions in response to it. In other words, a leader should be accustomed to the goals and members in the society to which he or she belongs, and should be aware of the favoured socio-cultural characteristics, the expectations and needs of the society according to situational conditions. In this sense, according to situation theory, leaders should speedily analyse the situation in which he or she is in and decide on the plan of action.

Transformation and Transactional Theories

However, due to the insufficiency of trait, behaviour and situational theories in explaining leadership, researchers developed a transformation theory which was later dismissed in favour of transactional theory in the 1980's (Downton, 1973). Transactional leadership emphasises that a leader sets a goal to achieve, delegate tasks to team members, and encourages them to work hard to attain the goal.

On the other hand, transformation theory is defined in terms of leaders' influences on the members (Bass, 1985). Transformation leadership stresses that the leader needs to motivate members by highlighting the importance and value of the task in order for them to transcend their private profits for the sake of the team and organisation, and to desire a high level of self-realisation beyond what they had initially expected. The latter leader considers and is concerned about the individuals comprising a team (Bass, 1990). This is considered to be the most ideal leadership as it provides aspirations about the future of the organisation to its members. It provokes and promotes a high level of motivation and therefore helps individuals to develop their abilities. Burns (1978) believed this type of leadership to be a means to improve the moral and motivational environment of the followers.

Style Theory

Style theory suggests that three styles of leadership are used by various leaders (Parker & Begnaud, 2004). The three styles of leadership are: democratic, autocratic, and laissez-faire styles.

Firstly, the democratic style of leadership is a desirable method of leadership which emphasises the need for all members to cooperate together to achieve a common goal. A leader who uses this type of leadership is independent, active, not restrained by internal conflicts, and possesses the personality that willingly gives rather than receives in terms of emotional economy; he or she is sensitive to others' emotions, are able to represent the group, and are able to influence others. Secondly, the autocratic style of leadership promotes an authoritarian or dictatorial leader. He or she puts emphasis on his or her own needs ahead of the needs of the group. Such activities force other members to submit to the leader's power or control. However such exploitation may lead to anxiety and conflicts within the group, ultimately damaging the group dynamic. Lastly, a leader with the laissez-faire style of leadership possesses passive attitudes and lets the members of his or her group do whatever they wish. These leaders do not fulfil their roles and steers members into leading themselves. The position of leadership is merely symbolical, and members enjoy freedom with regards to their work. This type of leadership is employed in universities or research centres where the members are held responsible for the independent organisation and completion of their work (Kim & Choi, 2005).

Other diverse leadership styles exist which are applied and emphasised according the different demands set by society, the times and context. For instance, there is moral leadership, which requires humanitarian, moral, and ethical attitudes, as well as charismatic leadership which motivates group members to do their work than to put pressure on them through expectations. In addition, Gardner (1995) further distinguished the leadership styles into two broad categories. He observed that there were direct and indirect modes of leadership where indirect leaders set examples to the rest of the group through their work. These were "individuals who come to be recognized as leaders because of the innovative and exemplary nature of their contributions to and within their own domains of endeavour" such as Beethoven or Einstein (as cited in Parker & Begnaud, 2004, p. ix). Direct leaders include those who lead nations or are heads of corporations or organisations (Parker & Beugnaud, 2004).

2.3. Literature Review III: Giftedness with Leadership

The relationship between the concept of leadership and giftedness was made evident in the 'Marland Report' (U.S. Commissioner of Education, 1972). The federal definition of giftedness highlighted that gifted students could be defined as those who have leadership ability amongst other abilities:

“Children capable of high performance include those with demonstrated achievement and/or potential ability in any of the following areas, singly or in combination: 1) general intellectual ability, 2) specific academic aptitude, 3) creative or productive thinking, 4) leadership ability, 5) visual or performing arts, 6) psychomotor ability (Marland, 1972, p. 2).

This definition emphasised the significance of leadership ability in gifted students, and was later used as the prototype for definitions of leadership adopted by most states of the US (Gallagher, Weiss, Oglesby, & Thomas, 1983). As a consequence of the seminal definition of giftedness, “leadership potential as one manifestation of giftedness is [now] commonly referred to in international descriptions of gifted students” (Cawood, 1984, p. 2).

Moreover, it was found that there are common features between gifted students and competent leaders (Jin & Cha, 2004). The list of common characteristics includes good communication skills, sociability, ambitiousness, problem solving skills, critical and creative thinking, attempting new challenges, and having a sense of responsibility and high self-satisfaction (Plowman, 1981; Black, 1984; Karnes & Bean, 1996). The characteristics shared by gifted individuals and leaders augmented the notion that gifted students would, as a matter of course, eventually become leaders in their respective regions, states or internationally without intervention. This notion was further strengthened by Renzulli's (1982) opinion that the top 15-20% of all the students could become international leaders. Therefore, the identification and development of leadership potential in gifted individuals who has been an oft-neglected topic (Jin & Cha, 2004).

Jin and Cha (2004) echo Lindsay (1988) who documented that leadership development in gifted education was a huge polemic but had been neglected in the field. Florey and Dorf (1986) also reported that leadership programmes were rarely included in the gifted curricula. This reflects the past and current situation whereby the importance of leadership development in gifted

education has gone unnoticed by many researchers and governments.

However, Forster and Silverman (1988) argued that schools should understand the basics of leadership, make an effort to integrate leadership education into the mainstream curriculum, and provide leadership education to gifted students. More recently, many researchers have articulated the necessity of combining leadership and giftedness in research and in practice by integrating leadership development in gifted education. E. J. Park (2007) encouraged the inclusion of the concept of leadership in gifted education, by arguing that a gifted programme would provide the ideal provide environment for developing leadership. Sisk (1993) further emphasised that a society without highly intelligent and creative leaders would not be able to function well, and that leadership training for gifted students should be necessarily carried out. Hence, it is essential to train students, and especially gifted students, in leadership in order for their development to become effective leaders of society.

In addition, Gardner's (1983, 1993, and 1995) multiple intelligences theory also mentions leadership in its definition of gifted children. Among his nine intelligences, there are: intra-personal intelligence, which enables people to understand themselves, and inter-personal intelligence which facilitates to associate, communicate, understand, and interpret others. These intra- and inter- personal intelligences can be assumed to be leadership characteristics as those who understand themselves and others well have the potential to become leaders (Kim et al., 2004). The "scales for rating the behavioural characteristics of superior students" of Renzulli et al. (2002 cited by Montgomery, 1996, p. 19) also incorporates leadership as well as creativity into its description of giftedness.

Likewise, several definitions of giftedness indicate that there are numerous cases where gifted children show characteristics of leadership (George, 1995). Leadership skills can also be seen separately as a form of giftedness. Marland (1972) stated that giftedness is not only limited to academic intelligence, but can be seen in strong motivation for achievement, sociability, and leadership qualities (K. Jun, 2000). Thus, whether leadership ability is seen as an independent form of giftedness or as an addition to academic giftedness, leadership development, for those with leadership skills, should be an integral part of gifted curricula.

The Korean government also stated that one of the main reasons for conducting gifted education was to develop new leaders in various fields. It stated that,

...in developing the gifted children's potentials to the best we can, these children will be able to grow towards self-actualisation and in every aspect of our society; they will be able to exhibit their abilities as leaders working towards national development and humanity (M. Kim, 2004, p. 30).

This view is complemented by the belief held in the Korean culture that a gifted child is a potential leader in society or in a particular subject area. Despite the belief that gifted children will grow up to become local or national leaders, in reality, due to the current Korean educational system which overly emphasizes knowledge-based education, little attention has been paid for the development of gifted students in any other way than academic. Therefore, the Korean government has not been able to identify nor develop a leadership scheme for gifted children thus far.

Over the decades, many researchers have recognised the necessity of leadership develop in gifted education. Although some opposition to this contention exists in the form of thinkers who advocate the innateness of leadership such as Aristotle, there are many researchers who emphasise the need for training in leadership skills, and this to begin in childhood Hensel (1990). Bloom's (1985) retrospective investigation of the lives of 120 internationally known leaders further strengthens the argument of leadership training is necessary, and it should beginning from a young age. Bloom's study illustrated that for most of the leaders, their environments had been continually filled with challenging experiences and many motivational features that had cultivated their leadership abilities. Moreover, the leaders had been experienced this stimulating environment from an early age. Bloom therefore concluded that the environment constructed by parents, teachers and society were very important in cultivating leadership. Bloom's results can be extrapolated to prospective cases; if appropriate learning environments are provided for those with leadership potential, namely the gifted population, the education system will be able to generate effective leaders.

2.4. Literature Review IV: Leadership Gifted Curriculum

2.4.1. Components to be Included in a Leadership Gifted Curriculum and Programme

In order to develop leadership in gifted students, schools need suitable leadership gifted curricula or programmes (C. S. Park, 2006). The common components involved in leadership gifted curricula will be investigated and compiled with a view to ultimately propose an ideal set of components to form the contents of a prospective model leadership gifted curriculum and programme later in the thesis.

Silverman (1993) believed that the following facets should be included in a leadership gifted curriculum:

- The knowledge of one's strengths
- The knowledge of global issues
- The ability to identify the positive characteristics of a good leader and the negative characteristics of a poor leader so that they can learn from them
- Understand the dynamics of a group
- Cooperating with others
- Practising cooperative communication skills

Karnes and Chauvin (1987) saw that for a leadership gifted curriculum, the most important features to be dealt with should be reading, discussing, group projects, self-assessment of skills, and working with mentors. Other central features included experiences to gain knowledge about leadership such as opportunities to experience leadership behaviour, learning about leadership attitudes, and having discussions regarding the skills of a leader so that they might formulate their own understandings of leadership.

Magoon (1981) emphasised that students should be taught both knowledge pertaining to leadership and leadership skills. Example contents are learning about leadership and their role as a person of service and assistance (knowledge), principles of democracy (knowledge), group activities (skills), characteristics of leaders (knowledge), and communication skills (skills).

Another researcher, Parker (1983), believed that in order to heighten leadership skills, four other skills should be acquired: cognitive skills, problem solving skills, interpersonal communication

and decision making skills (as cited in Davis & Rimm, 2001).

Various skills to aid leadership development have been compiled for leadership curricula and programmes. For instance, Magoon (1980) put forward a detailed practical training programme which includes class presidents and mentorship which would help teach young children solve problems with regards to the given rules. This skill may be furthered through leadership projects which include brainstorming with others with leadership skills and more involvement in local social projects (Davis & Rimm, 2001).

These academic perspectives on the contents of a model leadership development curricula/programme will be taken into account when proposing the suggestions for the formulation of such a curricula/programme suitable for the Korean educational context.

2.4.2. Potential Developments of Leadership Gifted Programmes

Maker and Nielson (1995) stated that “researchers looking to improve provision for gifted pupils are generally looking to provide a curriculum which is what you call ‘qualitatively different from the programme for all students’” (as cited in Eyre & McClure, 2001, p. 17). Similarly, in order to develop a curriculum for the development of leadership in the gifted, it must provide new concepts for it to be different from the programmes used for current gifted education in Korea.

In order to change and develop a curriculum, Gallagher (1985) suggested that its content, method and the learning environment should be the altered from the current education provided. Maker and Nielson (1995) indicated how the content, method and the learning environment could change in a specific sense. Changes to the content were to include “variety” for enrichment, “complexity/abstractness,” “problem solving,” “scaffolded learning” and “social interactional approaches.” Changes to the method were to change the tasks, enhance questioning, “increase pace”, “increase independence”, “increase direction” and “intellectual risk taking.” Possible changes to the learning context, is to have different programmes for the gifted, create “withdrawal groups”, “selective classes”, “mixed ability classrooms”, “classes with older children” and meet “non-school contexts” (p. 3).

Nevertheless, when there are any modifications or improvements made in a curriculum, the curriculum should focus on the culture and society that it is being made for, as well as

considering the moral and social development of children (DfEE, 2000). For instance, leadership gifted curricula for South Korea can be culturally adapted by teaching through traditional stories; Korean manners can be taught through poems; folk mentality and ideology can be taught through games; Korean culture can be taught by helping the students to understand more about Korean history. Further discussions can be conducted in morality, culture, and society to help them develop their own views on such topics.

2.4.3. Literature in the Area of Leadership Gifted Curricula

In an brief overview of the British gifted and talented literature, there were few empirical studies in gifted education during the early 1990's. By the mid 1990's, there was a "growing volume of literature" but their "work was still based on individual [researchers'] opinion[s], rather than rigorously conducted empirical studies" (White, Fletcher-Campbell & Ridley, 2003, p. 3). The most well-known academics of the time included Freeman (1991), Eyre (1997), George (1995), and Montgomery (1996). In the late 1990's much interest was shown in the gifted and talented children of the United Kingdom and the United States and more literature on the topic was written. However, White et al. (2003, p. 3) argued that much of the literature was still not based on strong empirical research, but drew upon experiences in the classroom.

In terms of gifted curricula and education in a practical sense, Fletcher-Campbell (2003) believed that gifted education must be seen and applied like special needs education where "specialness can be embedded in all activities" (p. 3). Recently, the National Foundation for Educational Research stated that a "national evaluation of gifted provision" is necessary in order to find out which methods are useful for teaching (Fletcher-Campbell, 2003, p. 3). They also mentioned that standardised criteria evaluating the effectiveness of such education are important in order to give feedback towards the development of gifted education curricula and programmes (Moon & Rosselli, 2000; refer to Chapter 5). This is a problem that exists in the Western world as well as the Eastern educational world as there is no standardised criteria to evaluate gifted or leadership curricula or programmes, and therefore various programmes are used in Korea without passing through a rigorous evaluative process (C. S. Park, 2006).

In terms of Korean literature, there was very little literature focusing on empirical studies of gifted education as practical interest in gifted education, in reality, commenced in the late 1990's (KEDI, 2000, p. 3). Academic literature in Korea tended to be translations from the United States or edited compilations of articles formed into books. Recent books reflecting on

the experiences in gifted education exist, but they are mainly aimed at parents and are guidelines rather than academic research into the field. Nonetheless, presently, a gifted education team has been assembled by the Korean Educational Development Institute and rigorous research is being conducted, producing new books on such research (Korean Educational Development Institute, 2000, p. 29).

2.5. Cultural Differences

2.5.1. Definitions of Culture

There are numerous different perceptions of the concept of culture. Williams (1965) categorised the various definitions into three main types. Firstly, culture can be seen as the 'ideal' whereby culture is a state or a process in terms of universal values that people possess. Chung (2004) also emphasised that currently, the meaning of culture has been developed to also include creating values. Secondly, there is the 'documentary' view of culture in which culture can be seen as being a recorded "body of intellectual and imaginative work" expressing "human thought and experience" (p. 57). Thirdly, there is the 'social' definition in which culture is a "description of a particular way of life, which expresses certain meanings and values not only in art and learning but also in institutions and ordinary behaviour" (p. 57). The 'social' definition of culture is further described by Leach (1982) where the society is portrayed as being "socially stratified...and each stratum in the system is marked by its own distinctive cultural attributes – linguistic images, manners, styles of food, housing etc" (p. 43).

Despite the diversity of the understandings of culture, Byram (1989) emphasised the shared nature of culture as he believed that culture is 'knowledge' which is shared between people. Geertz (1975) also emphasised that culture is a "system of inherited conceptions expressed in a symbolic form by means of which men communicate, perpetuate and develop their knowledge about attitudes about life" (p. 89).

Overall, the intricate nature of the concept of culture has been described as "that complex whole which includes knowledge, belief, art, morals, law, custom, and any other capabilities and habits acquired by man as a member of society" (Tylor, 1871, p. 1). Similarly, the multifaceted nature of culture is evident as Keats (1997, p. 2) states that "one's culture includes all that makes up one's lifestyle, values, occupations, interpersonal relationships, the literature, the media, what one can buy what one can attain, one's natural environment, and the ways in which the

accumulated knowledge of society is passed on to the next generation and modified by science, technology and the arts.” The concept of culture is however, continually evolving as Barnperson (1994, cited by Kang, p. 20) argues that although in the past, culture was highly associated with religion, arts, philosophies, sciences and politics, more recent perception of culture is centred on the society and respect for people in it.

2.5.2. The Comparison Eastern and Western Cultures

The importance of cultures can be seen in that all cultures influence the formation of atmospheres or contexts of home, work places, and schools. Eastern societies have a strong tendency to emphasise social structures (rather than individualism), social rules, compliance to social values, and is thus characterised by hierarchical relationships and the suppression of individuality. In contrast, Western societies are characterised by individual freedom and rights, and is portrayed by respect of the individual. Eastern societies value traits of character such as endurance and submission, while Western society emphasises characteristics such as pursuit of liberty (Runco & Johnson, 2002; K. H. Kim, 2005).

In terms of the impact of culture in the homes of children, it is usually in Eastern homes that rules are important, and hierarchical relationships between parents and children is highly regarded as parents are expected to give orders and solutions to problems to their children with authority and pressure. On the other hand, Western homes generally put less emphasis on rules, positions, and roles, emphasising humour at home, and place more values on the development of imagination than school grades (Csikszentmihalyi, 1999; Stremikis, 2002; Davis & Rimm, 2004; Feldman, 1999).

The workplaces in Eastern cultures hardly encourage free decision-making and are rather controlled by external assessments and constant evaluations. The workers in Korea often suffer from excess workloads and there is a severe sense of competition amongst individuals and groups. Many workers are less adaptable to changes and are reluctant to take risks. Conversely, most Western workplaces encourage individual decision-making, are encouraged to provide new ideas, and workers are assessed less than in Korea. Workplaces tend to accept failures, are cooperative, and typically give more time to the workers to solve problems compared to workplaces in Eastern cultures (Amabile, 1996). Overall, according to Amabile (1996), the Eastern and Western cultures are quite contrasting and found that the Eastern culture has more ‘penalties’ or rules rather than the Western culture.

2.5.3. Korean Education

Whereas Western schools are characterised by innovation, diversity, creativity, imagination, originality, and open debates (Kim, 2005), learning in schools in Eastern cultures is characterised by rote learning, suppression of emotions, stressing morality, assiduousness, and harmony, whilst discouraging students from playing. This is mainly due to the Eastern cultural mentality which is to value the outcome rather than the means to the result, and can be said to be performance goal oriented as opposed to learning goal oriented (Dweck, 2000).

This is particularly the case in Korea as schools focus on examination performance due to the high competitiveness in entering universities; thus, this leads schools to only focus on academic subjects being taught through rote learning method in order to cram as much information into the lessons as possible (refer to section 5.3.3.c.). This performance orientation of children is influenced by the mentality of the parents who impact the development of children's thoughts (Jun, 2000, p. 577). Performance is emphasised as most Korean parents elevate the academic performance rather than the enjoyment of learning.

This is because the Korean culture tends to value the academic institution that a person graduated from rather than one's personality or intelligence (D. Kim, 2003). Thus, rather than to value a person's ability and enthusiasm in a subject, it is more important for them to enter an elite university. Such emphasis on performance in education in Korean culture is typical of Eastern cultures as it leads to "their choice of secondary school, providing access to university, followed by a good career – and a good pension" (Freeman, 2004, p. 47). This was supported by educational research in Asian American students who were found to believe that "success in life has to do with the things studied in school" (Sue & Okazaki, 1990, p. 917). In this sense, "education has been functional for upward mobility" (p. 919).

Consequently, Korean students aim to gain acceptance into an elite university, which brings about fierce competition in university entry examinations (Sutcliffe, 1997). In other words, students exert much effort into schoolwork for high achievement. As many Eastern cultures believe that all children have similar potential, "the difference in their achievement are [attributed] ... to their hard work" (Freeman, 2004, p. 47). Dweck (2000, p. 150) however, criticises these Asian cultures as students have "great anxiety over their grades and test scores, great pressure not to shame their families, and depression or humiliation over poor performance."

2.5.3. Culture and Gifted Education

Unlike in Western cultures, Koreans have a stereotyped negative view towards gifted children as those who are physically weak and socially awkward (Jun, 2000). In contrast, Terman (1925), who greatly influenced the typical American view of gifted students, promoted a positive concept of the gifted as those who are academically, physically and socially able (Freeman, 2003).

The same cultural differences can also be seen in nurturing children. Whilst the Western culture emphasises the individual abilities of children and attempts to develop them (Ng, 2003), the Korean cultural emphasis on collectivist society (due to being traditionally rooted in Confucianism) discourages children in displaying atypical behaviours or abilities (Refer to section 4.1.5). Similarly, Chao's (1993) research revealed that whilst 64% of Western mothers nurtured their children to develop their individual abilities, merely 8% of Chinese mothers stated the same.

In terms of the cultural differences in perceptions of gifted education, Korean parents understand gifted education as being a "bourgeois education" (S. H. Cho, 2002b, p. 29). Many Korean parents also have a sense of contempt towards gifted education as they believe that gifted education gives unfair advantage to a minority of students when entering universities, especially in a culture whereby academic achievement and university entrance is highly competitive (refer to section 2.1.3). However, despite such negative views, many Korean parents insist that "most of their children have gifted potential," as opposed to Western cultures believing that "few children have gifted potential" (Freeman, 2004, p. 41), leading to many complications such as training their children to enter gifted education. This is because Koreans believe that "almost every baby is seen as being born with good potential and for each, the main difference in progression in their rate of development hard work" (Freeman, p. 45). Such prominence put on effort for students in Korea has led to promoting "unhealthy private education, accelerating social inequality" making the society into "academic, background-oriented" society (J. Lee, 2005, p. 13).

2.5.4. Culture and Leadership

Pye and Pye (1985) argue that the concept of leadership is different in each culture. Various cultures have their own methods of expressing leadership, with their own preferred stereotypical

images of a leader; thus, as cultures change, the concept of leadership also changes. For instance, cultures can shift from pursuing charismatic, authoritative, and submissive leadership to friendly, democratic, and free leadership.

In terms of the Korean view of leadership, a good leader is one who “integrates the organisation by collecting members’ opinions and solving conflicts amongst members” (Shin, 2001, p. 111). Such belief is a reaction against the authoritarian style of Korean leaders who tend to emphasise the aims of an organisation, exercise self-centred influences, and to wield the power position. However, nowadays, Koreans prefer democratic leaders who receive trust from the group members and prepare themselves to show favourable traits to them (Kim & Choi, 2005).

In terms of developing leaders, there are fundamental philosophical differences between the East and the West. An example of such difference can be seen in the working world; while the Western culture chooses and employs people who are necessary for a sector concerned, the Eastern culture trains the employee whom the system requires rather than selecting people for recruitment.

There are also cultural differences in the contents of the curricula used in schools. Montgomery (1997, p. 171) stated that “the curriculum comprises of a selection of knowledge and skills that a culture regards as worthwhile for its members to acquire.” Eastern and Western history, politics, values and cultures vary greatly, especially including how a culture views and expects in a leader. Kim et al. (2004) highlighted that the concept of leadership development cannot be explained or taught outside a society or culture as one’s development of one’s leadership potential is highly dependent on the environment. Thus, a curriculum should ideally be adapted to a specific culture’s values as “one needs a better understanding of the local culture, politics and history” when comprising educational materials for daily use in the culture (Wong, 2001, p. 36). Such importance of the culture and environment on one’s education and development is also supported by Hofstede (1996 cited by Wong, 2001, p. 36) who concluded: “In attempting to understand institutional differences, one needs history, and in understanding history one needs culture... Thinking is affected by the kind of family they grew up in, the kind of school they went to, the kind of authorities and legal system they are accustomed to. The causality between institutions and culture is circular; they cannot be separated.”

2.5.5. Culture and Leadership Gifted Education

Such differences between the two cultures are visible in their goals for gifted education. The primary goal of gifted education in Korea is to develop students as future leaders who should contribute to society. Thus, gifted education is conducted for the good of the state rather than for the individual students (Park et al., 2003). The Korean government also emphasised that the aim of training the gifted is for them to “be able to exhibit their abilities as leaders working towards national development and humanity” (M. Kim, 2004, p. 30). This therefore led many researchers to acknowledge the need for gifted students to receive leadership education to aid these gifted students in becoming leaders (Jin & Cha, 2004; Kim et al., 2004).

In contrast, although the Western literature also document the need for gifted leadership development for the good of the society (Eyre, 2004), as many believe that gifted students should be given leadership education to develop into “tomorrow’s social, intellectual, economic and cultural leaders” (Eyre, 2004 cited from Brooke-Smith, 2006, p. 14), the primary aim of gifted education in the West, or America in particular, is being a means to aid students to be satisfied in themselves through expressing their potential (Renzulli, 1986). Thus, for this thesis, research will be conducted to find out more about the views of the gifted teachers on the needs of their students for leadership education.

The main difference in teaching leadership skills to students in the Western and the Eastern culture is that the Korean culture considers moral education as a significant aspect of leadership development, more so than in Western cultures. This emphasis on moral education is the result of the cultural background in Confucianism (Wong & Evers, 2001, p. 37). There are some researchers who consider moral education as a significant component of any curricula (May, 1971). However, the extent to which moral education is a valued part of leadership education in the Eastern cultures is discussed by Wong (2001) who stated that Eastern cultures strongly emphasise preparing leaders in a moral sense. Thus, for this research project, it will be investigated whether Korean gifted teachers also share the view, emphasising the need for moral aspect of leadership education.

2.6. Conclusion

In conclusion, in reference to the research questions which ask of the concepts of leadership and giftedness and its relationship, the literature review indicated that there have been relatively few

empirical studies on leadership giftedness. In Eastern countries like Korea, gifted children are considered as being future leaders. Gifted education is seen as a process to identify and train future leaders who will lead the nation and therefore, gifted education is partly performed for the good of the nation rather than the individual (Park et al., 2003).

In the Western world, gifted education and leadership ability is also related; Eyre (2004) stated in a European conference that today's gifted students are future society's leaders of intelligence, community, and economy. Thus, gifted education should be cultivated as it is significant in the development of our societies. Brooke (2006) asserted that we "should not leave our education to chance" (p. 14). In order to compete and collaborate with the globalised world, every nation should make efforts to produce more leaders; gifted education should be devoted to produce leaders through the combined efforts of educationalists, the business world and the local communities (Brooke, 2006, p. 16).

Chapter 3: An Investigation of Korean Gifted Education Teachers' Views on Leadership (50 Schools)

The focus of the study is to explore the views of Korean gifted teachers on leadership and gifted education. The enquiry into the teachers' views will be shaped by the following four research questions:

No.	Research Question	Summary of Answers	Main Sections to Refer to
b)	<i>What is the current situation of gifted education in South Korea?</i>	The Korean gifted education situation is described, mentioning issues such as their lack of variety of subjects in gifted education, lack of teacher training, changes in cultural and parental thoughts, and the lack of appropriate gifted programmes in Korea.	Chapter 3.3.1. (pp. 83-86).
		The research question was also answered through QTOGGLE.	Chapter 3.4. (p.91)
c)	<i>How do teachers understand the relationship between giftedness and leadership and is there a demand for leadership education in gifted students?</i>	The Korean teachers believed that not all gifted students have leadership ability. Most teachers however believed that all gifted students should receive leadership education. This implies that leadership education should be available to all gifted students regardless of their leadership abilities.	Chapter 3.4. (p.92)
d)	<i>What do the teachers understand the necessary components and characteristics of leadership gifted curricula to be?</i>	QTOGGLE results showed that the five most popular categories for leadership gifted education were: moral education, respect for others, intellectual abilities, communication abilities, personal relationship skills.	Chapter 3.4 (p.92)
e)	<i>How adequate are the available leadership gifted curricula and programmes for the Korean gifted educational context?</i>	Teachers' replies from the QTOGGLE showed that 10 schools of which said that they implemented some form of leadership education for the gifted was inadequate as it was unsystematic, too theoretical and impractical.	Chapter 3.4. (pp.92-93)

Research questions (b) and (e) were posed to examine the contextual grounds for research; specifically to assay the situation and characteristics of leadership gifted education in Korea. Research question (e) is in specific reference to the adequacy of the Eastern cultural emphasis on moral education. Investigating the situational context of Korean leadership gifted education serves two-fold purposes: firstly, by depicting the situational context, the limitations

of the current system can be noted and consequently suggestions can be made in its advancement; secondly, it allows the interpreting of some of the teachers' opinions within the context. Research questions (c) and (d) concern teachers' views: their teaching experience places them in a valuable position of voicing their opinions on the efficacy of and possible improvements for the current leadership gifted curricula. In later chapters, the teachers' opinions will be taken into account alongside relevant research and available leadership gifted curricula/programme, to fashion the definitive conclusions of this thesis.

3.1. Methodology

In this chapter, the research methods or design and data collection employed in the research project will be explored. This section will discuss the issues concerning the participant selection, methods used for data collection and the plans for data analysis in my research.

In order to gain in-depth knowledge of the teachers' perspectives as well as the socio-cultural context, a qualitative and quantitative method will be used (Marshall & Rossman, 1995). The proposed research will support a mixed methods design which will enable the researcher to gain a deeper understanding of the relationships between gifted education, leadership and gifted leadership programmes, using a questionnaire survey and interviews. The quantitative data will be supported by qualitative evidence of in-depth interviews with Korean gifted education teachers. Prior to beginning the proposed research, the Questionnaire on Teachers' Opinions on Gifted and Leadership Education (QTOGLE) was piloted on 50 teachers in order to improve, expand, and remove sections of the questionnaire where necessary.

3.1.1. Sampling

In this research, stratified sampling is used as all the Korean schools are divided in terms of giftedness and age. Within the divided groups of schools, a set number of mainstream schools which offered gifted programmes and Centres for the Gifted were selected through opportunity sampling within the areas near the South Korean capitol, the Seoul region, and the Gyeonggi province which surrounds the capitol area. The reason why Gyeonggi province and the Seoul area was chosen for this study was because gifted education is actively implemented in these areas. The teachers participated in the research through filling in questionnaires and through telephone interviews.

The questionnaires were sent to 170 Korean gifted education institutions (refer to Table 3.1). The questionnaires were sent through post to 75 independent Korean mainstream primary schools with special gifted classes; 36 state primary and national mainstream primary schools (in Gyeonggi province) and 22 schools (in Seoul area), which run gifted programmes after school; and to 37 Centres for the Gifted run by the school boards in various regions, which are open outside of school hours. The questionnaires were not sent to any special gifted schools as they only exist as specialised high schools and not as primary schools (refer to Appendix I).

A copy of the QTOGGLE was sent to a teacher in each primary school, who directed gifted education in that institution. Prior to sending the questionnaires to them, the gifted education teachers in schools or education offices were contacted and the purpose of the research and the questionnaire processes were explained to them. The questionnaires were later sent through the post with a covering letter that reminded them of the aims and purposes of the study (refer to Appendix III). A few days later, their receipt of the questionnaires was confirmed through telephone and the researcher once again asked teachers to fill out the questionnaire. After receiving the copies of questionnaires from them, they were sent an email or a letter through post expressing the researcher's gratitude for their participation.⁷

Conducting questionnaire surveys are generally difficult in Korea because in Korean culture, people rarely reply to questionnaires unless there is personal contact. Thus, in this research, every school/teacher had to be contacted through telephone or email several times after dispatching the questionnaires to confirm their participation in the study. The questionnaires were sent out in March, 2005 and questionnaire replies were received for the next 6 months, until August, 2005.

In terms of the distribution of the QTOGGLE, the number of schools the questionnaire was sent to and the replies received are summarised as follows (refer to Table 3.1)

Types of Schools	Number of Schools the Questionnaire was sent to	Number of Schools that Responded
Korean Mainstream State and National Primary Schools	58 (State primary schools: 48; National primary schools: 10)	44 (State primary schools: 36; National primary schools: 8)
Korean Independent Primary Schools	75	0

Centres for the Gifted	37 (Regional head centres: 16; Centres in Gyeonggi: 21)	6 (Regional head centres: 3; Centres in Gyeonggi: 3)
Total	170	50

Table 3.1: The Number of Schools the Questionnaire was sent to, and the Number of Schools that Responded per Each Type of Gifted Education Providers in Korea.

All 75 independent Korean gifted primary schools reported that they could not respond to private and independent questionnaires. From the remaining 58 national and state mainstream primary schools, 44 schools participated in the research. Out of 37 Centres for the Gifted, there were 6 replies. Overall, 50 replies out of 170 distributed questionnaires were returned. In other words, the response rate of the teachers was 29.4% of the questionnaires sent.

The questionnaire was distributed to 170 out of 555 gifted education providing institutes, which is 30.6% of all institutes providing gifted education in Korea (refer to Appendix II). The QTOGGLE was distributed to 133 out of 291 or 45% of all mainstream state and national primary schools providing gifted education. Out of 264 Centres for the Gifted, 37 centres were contacted for this research; thus, 14% of all Centres for the Gifted in Korea were distributed the QTOGGLE. The 37 Centres for the Gifted were made up of 16 centres run by the Seoul metropolitan school board and 21 centres run by the Gyeonggi provincial school board (refer to Table 3.1).

In this research, only primary school teachers were considered despite the fact that Koreans generally believe that leadership characteristics cannot be clearly determined until children are in middle school when their interests in their environments increase; hence, leadership education is usually instigated at approximately this age (Kim, 2004, p. 2). However, it is commonly stated in the leadership literature that leadership education should be given at an earlier age (Hollingworth, 1946; Wu & Cho, 1993). Unless children are identified and assisted in developing their skills and talents from an early age, there is a possibility that their abilities may disappear with time (S. H. Cho, 1995). Monson (1984) reported that even if a child is gifted and talented, if the child is in a position where the ability cannot be developed, they may achieve at an average level in the particular field. Hence, early identification and development of talents in children are advisory (Kim, Yoon, Yoon, & Kim, 2003, p. 4).

3.1.2. Pilot Study and Research Paradigm

Prior to the distribution of the questionnaires, they were piloted to 6 Korean typical and gifted education teachers in South Korea. It is necessary to pilot new questionnaires as piloting will help to increase their reliability, validity, practicability (Oppenheim, 1992; Wilson & McLean, 1994) and the “clarity of the questionnaire items, instructions and layout” (Cohen et al., 2000, p. 247). In order to achieve this objective, the 6 teachers were asked to comment on ways to improve the questionnaire after its completion.

In terms of its usability, all 6 teachers replied that the items and the layout were clear, easy to understand and use. They also commented that the topic of research was a useful one as Korea is yet to conduct much research in leadership gifted education. However, one teacher commented that she found the subject of the questionnaire surprising and inappropriate for current Korean gifted educational context.

She expounded her argument by reasoning that gifted education should be researched rigorously first, before researching about leadership gifted education. Thus, in Korea where giftedness research is still in a relatively nascent state, the teacher believed leadership giftedness research to be several steps ahead of the current position of Korean educational research. Notwithstanding, she acknowledged that leadership education should still be developed for the future leaders who may be receiving gifted education.

The main suggestion advanced by the teachers concerned the items in the questionnaire. The original questionnaire that had been piloted to the 6 teachers had consisted only of closed questions, with the rationale being that the responses to such questions could be readily analysed as closed questions facilitate comparisons to be made across sample groups (Oppenheim, 1992). However, despite the advantages of closed questions, such as their relative ease in answering, the need for open-ended questions was emphasised by the teachers. They believed that by providing the teachers with the opportunity to “add any remarks, qualifications and explanations to the categories” (Cohen et al., 2000, p. 248) through the inclusion of open-ended questions, it would assist in the attempt to understand the views of the teachers on a deeper level and profit from their experiences.

Therefore, the questionnaire was amended to include both closed and open-ended items. Some dichotomous and multiple-choice questions were modified into open-ended questions for a more “free response in their own terms, to explain and qualify their responses and avoid the

limitations of pre-set categories of response” (Cohen et al., 2000, p. 248).

As a further suggestion, a subset of the teachers advised conducting an interview consisting of open-ended questions in order to gain both in-depth and more accurate teachers’ views on giftedness, leadership and leadership giftedness. Therefore, a decision was made to conduct semi-structured interviews with some of the Korean gifted educators that participated in the questionnaire and the director of KEDI (who also completed the questionnaire) to complement the data collected from the questionnaire. Semi-structured interviews were selected for their faculty for “the contents to be re-ordered, digressions and expansions made, new avenues to be included and further probing to be included” (Cohen et al., 2000, p. 146). The items that were selected to guide the interviews were questions that were considered to be central to the aims of this research.

In taking the results of the pilot study responses into account, there have been some changes in the approach or paradigmatic view of research. A paradigm is a way of perceiving the world, “composed of certain philosophical assumptions that guide and direct thinking and action” (Mertens, 2005, p. 7). In educational research, a dichotomous view between interpretive/naturalistic and positivist/rationalistic paradigms exist (Guba & Lincoln, 1994). The relationships between the paradigms can be seen in three ways: firstly, the complementary diversity thesis emphasises that there are different strengths and weaknesses of the paradigms and therefore should complement each other; secondly, the oppositional diversity thesis views that the paradigms cannot co-exist in research; finally, the unity thesis highlights the similarities in epistemology in the paradigms (Walker & Evers, 1999).

Initially, this research adopted a more positivistic paradigm in the sense that it was believed that the social reality exists independently of the researcher. Hence, this research aimed at gaining the ‘truth’ or the reality of the gifted education situation in Korea presently. Thus, a closed question questionnaire was initially planned to have quantitative results in seeking the Korean educational ‘reality’. However, the pilot study results showed that the teachers preferred a less structured approach and suggested the research to adopt a more interpretive paradigm. In other words, where positivism understands research to describe the ‘true’ reality, Humphries (1994) believe that it is difficult to “treat people as being separate from the social contexts” (p. 76). Furthermore, a less structured research design was chosen as a highly structured one would not be able to collect any unplanned data.

Thus, a more interpretivist paradigm was employed in this research as an interpretivist paradigm is concerned with understanding human experiences and social phenomena. The researcher may therefore aim to interpret the social world but can never fully grasp the views of the participants. In this sense, in this research, the views of the teachers were less seen as the direct report of the Korean gifted education system, as it was believed initially in this research, but rather as the opinions and perspectives of the teachers with experiences in gifted or leadership education and gifted students. In this sense, the results of the pilot study not only affected the type of questionnaire used but also the theoretical paradigm utilised throughout the research.

3.1.3. Questionnaire

The views of the gifted education teachers on giftedness, leadership, their relationship and the Korean gifted educational context were obtained using the main research instrument: the QTOGGLE questionnaire (refer to Appendix III). Thomas and Brubaker (2000) described questionnaires as a tool in collecting the target individuals' answers to questions relating to their "life condition, beliefs or attitudes" (p. 155).

The questionnaire was separated into three sub-questionnaires. Questionnaire I is comprised of 11 questions which were answered by all the teachers. Questionnaire II consisted of the next 12 questions in the questionnaire, and were answered by those who had leadership curricula within their schools. Questionnaire III was an alternative section to Questionnaire II, for those who did not have a leadership curriculum implemented in their schools.

At the item level, the QTOGGLE incorporated both closed and open-ended questions which assessed the teachers' perspectives on the main research topics. Closed questions can be further subdivided into dichotomous items and multiple choice items, and open-ended questions can be divided into short-answer items and narrative or essay items.

Two examples of dichotomous questions included in the questionnaire are:

- Do you think the idea of identifying children as gifted in the idea of leadership is valid one?

Yes

No

- Do you think leadership skills can be taught/ developed?

Yes

No

Arguably the principal advantage of dichotomous items is that the ‘items can be quickly answered and the results easily compiled’ (Thomas & Brubaker, 2000, p. 155). However, a critical weakness behind dual-choice questions is their binary nature and the mutual exclusivity that underlies the responses, which respondents may also find restrictive. These questions fail to elucidate the reasons behind the respondents’ opinions. Thus, they do not provide much information in terms of teachers’ opinions. A further limitation of this question format is the risk of the respondent being careless when providing due to their ease in response.

Multiple choice questions are similar to dichotomous questions in that they present the respondent with a choice between a selection of preset answers. However, unlike dual-choice questions, the respondents are offered three or more alternatives. Two examples of multiple choice questions used in the QTOGLE are:

- Which one area of giftedness do the gifted children of your school specialise in?

Science

Music

Mathematics

Physical Education

General

Others

- When do you think is the suitable age for children to begin leadership curricula?

Year 1-2

Year 3-4

Year 5-6

Middle school

High school

University

Post-University

The advantages and disadvantages of multiple choice questions are the same as those of the dichotomous items. Cohen et al. (2000, p. 251) state that multiple choice questions, “seldom gives more than a crude statistic for words are inherently ambiguous”. However, the clarity in the wording of the multiple choice questions were checked during the pilot study and care was taken in avoiding the formation of multiple choice items involving ambiguous concepts. To counter the limitations of the closed questions, more open-ended questions were included in this questionnaire.

Short answer items which require the respondent to answer with a word or a phrase were included in QTOGLE. An example of a short answer item can be seen in the QTOGLE:

- Do you have leadership development curricula for gifted children?

Yes

No

If so, what kind of curricula and programmes does your school use? Would you write down the details? _____

The advantage of this question format is that it gives respondents the freedom to offer their own answers rather than to be constrained to a specified set of preset answers. However, a potential shortcoming of this question format is the uncontrolled range of answers that may be given which may prove difficult in the interpretation of results.

Narrative questions aim to find out the detailed beliefs or attitudes held by the respondent by asking their opinions or experiences with the research topic (Thomas & Brubaker, 2000). A few examples of narrative questions included in the QTOGLE are: “Do you believe that the moral education taught at your school is sufficient?” and “What do you believe the aim of gifted education to be?”

Despite the greater detail that can given through open-ended questions, a disadvantage in asking open questions is that it will take much time and effort to answer the questions on the part of the respondents and also on the part of the interviewer in analysing the responses (H. E. Suh, 2003, p. 31-32). Respondents may therefore be more likely to avoid answering these questions.

3.1.4. Interviews

Interviews are used in ethnographic research, case studies, surveys and biographies (Thomas & Brubaker, 2000). There are 4 types of interview strategies. Firstly, there is the “loose-question strategy” whereby open-ended questions are asked by the interviewer in order to “reveal the variable ways respondents interpret a general question” (Thomas & Brubaker, 2000, p. 151). For instance, an example of this type of question in this research is in the interviews with gifted education teachers: “What do you think is the most urgent necessity in the Korean gifted education situation, taking into account of the fact that gifted education is rapidly being developed area in Korea recently?”

Secondly, there is the “tight-question strategy” which is a restricted strategy, giving the

respondents a very limited number of choices of answers. An example in my research is: “Do you have any moral education and personal education at your school? Do you have special programmes for moral education in your school?”

A third type of interview strategy is the “converging-question strategy” where there is a mix of loose-questions as well as tight-questions in the course of the interview. This is usually in the form of starting an interview with an open-ended question which is followed by a tight-ended question in response to the answer given for the previous question.

Finally, a fourth type of interview strategy is the response-guided strategy which was made famous by Piaget (1975). His “clinical method” was used in interviewing children as children did not respond nor understand questions in the same way; therefore their responses were taken into account when asking the next question (Thomas & Brubaker, 2000, p. 152).

In this research, semi-structured interviews were conducted as it is more structured than an open conversation but is more open than a strictly structured interview. In this type of interview, a digression of topic will be allowed for a deeper understanding of the topic (Berg, 2001). Hence, this type of interviewing suits the data collection needed to answer research questions which are of a more causal nature, requiring more of in-depth perspectives on leadership and gifted education. However, there are disadvantages in the use of semi-structured interviews as it ‘involves a complex set of social relationships that can contaminate the final product’ (Verma & Mallick, 1999, p.128). The issues related to reliability and validity of the interview process is described below.

3.1.5. Reliability and Validity

The questionnaire survey and interview must be ensured for reliability and validity. Cohen et al. (2000, p. 117) defined reliability as ‘consistency and replicability over time, over instruments and over groups of respondents’, and validity as an assessment of whether an instrument measures what it claims as measuring. A one-way dependency exists between the reliability and validity of a test instrument: reliability is a necessary prerequisite of validity. This section endeavours to provide an overview of the precautions taken to ensure maximal reliability and validity in the two test instruments.

In regards to the questionnaire, Cohen et al. (2000, p. 129) states that the reliability of postal

questionnaires is generally higher than interviews due to their anonymous nature which promotes greater sincerity in the answers. Nevertheless, threats to reliability can come in the form of different interpretations of the questions by different respondents. This was countered by conducting a pilot questionnaire on 6 Korean teachers, who confirmed that the questions were clear and easy to understand.

The validity of the questionnaires can be threatened by dishonesty on the part of the respondents and non-response. Benson (1986) suggested the use of an intensive interview method to check the accuracy of the responses to a questionnaire (as cited in Cohen et al., 2000, p. 128). This study conducted complementary interviews on two of the teachers who took part in the questionnaire; although the interviews do not fit the criterion of the 'intensive interview method' outlined by Benson (1986) nor were they conducted on all respondents of the questionnaire, the two cases demonstrated that the opinions expressed in the interview mirrored those conveyed through the questionnaire. Hence, this preliminary data indicate some accuracy in the opinions expressed in the questionnaire. Secondly, the problem that non-response brings to validity, that whether the teachers who did not reply would have given similar perspectives as those to did, was minimised by employing many of the strategies proposed by Hudson and Miller (1997) to maximise the response rate, such as, "including stamped addressed envelopes" and "following up questionnaires with a personal telephone call" (as cited in Cohen et al., 2000, p. 128).

Concerning the interviews, Silverman (1993) argued that structure in interviews was one way to increase reliability (as cited in Cohen et al., 2000, p. 121). Therefore the semi-structured nature of the interviews where "same format and sequence of words and questions" (p. 121) used to guide the interview improved its reliability. The two teacher interviews were conducted over the telephone, possibly increasing reliability by encouraging the respondents to express opinions which they may not normally express if approached in person. Conversely, the disclosure of their names in the research could be a threat to the reliability of the interviews as it may lead to alterations in their replies due to social desirability. Nevertheless, the interviewees were asked whether they wished to disclose their names prior to conducting the interviews. In the case of validity, validity is increased by minimizing the amount of bias involved in the interview process. The use of leading questions was avoided in the compilation of the questions asked during the interviews. However, there are still some remaining issues concerning validity: as the researcher was in the presence of one of the participants during the interview, actions of the researcher might lead the participant to say

things they believe the researcher would like (Cohen et al., 2000). There may also be gender, age and ethnicity differences between the interviewee and the interviewer which may affect the interview content.

Nevertheless, in sum, it is acknowledged that it is impossible to completely eradicate all threats to reliability and validity but many lengths were taken to maximise the reliability and validity of the two measures used in this research.

3.1.6. Ethical Considerations

Various ethical guidelines were taken into account when conducting the questionnaires and the interviews. In order to ensure that the questionnaires were following the ethical guidelines, the participants were informed of the aims of the study from the outset and no known deception was involved. When the participants were asked to participate in the study, they were informed of their right to withdraw at any time; this included their right to request their questionnaires/remove data collected from the research, and the right to leave items unanswered should they wish to do so (Refer to Appendix III). They were also guaranteed anonymity and confidentiality in research participation. Their decisions to participate in the research were taken to mean informed consent was given.

In order to ensure that the ethical guidelines were upheld for the conduct of interviews, two participant teachers were chosen at random from the 50 teachers who had participated in the first phase of data collection: questionnaires. The Director of KEDI was chosen as the third interviewee in order to gain the perspective of a specialist researcher of Korean gifted education. The three participants were contacted after their completion of the questionnaires and were further asked whether they wished to partake in the second component of the data collection. The participants were explained the details of the interview fully and were ensured of their confidentiality should they wish to remain anonymous. They were further informed that the written records would be kept of the interview, which would be shown in a research thesis. As previously mentioned, they were also informed of their right to withdraw and leave any questions unanswered. All three participants offered verbal consent to interview participation and agreed in the disclosure of their names, positions and interview contents.

3.2. Results

3.2.1. Questionnaire Results (44 Schools and 6 Centres of the Gifted)

a. Participating Schools and Teachers

At the beginning of the questionnaire, the participating teachers were asked about the type of school they taught in (Figure 3.1), their particular role within the school and the length of their careers (refer to Appendix VI to see the raw data collected from the questionnaire). The questionnaire was answered by 50 primary school teachers in South Korea (refer to Table 3.1). 36 of the 50 teachers worked in state primary schools and 8 teachers worked in national primary schools. The remaining 6 teachers work in the Centres for the Gifted.

From the 50 teachers, 2 were assistant head teachers and 24 were head of year teachers. 18 were class form teachers and 6 were the heads of the Centres for the Gifted in Korea (refer to Table 3.2).

With regards to their teaching experience, 10 of the teachers had taught for 5 to 10 years. 22 of the teachers had worked for 10-20 years whilst there were 16 teachers who had worked for more than 20 years (refer to Table 3.3). Overall, 76% of the teachers or 38 out of the 50 teachers were well-experienced in that they had been working for over 10 years in the teaching profession.




Figure 3.1: The Number of Teachers who Participated per Each Type of School.

Teacher's Positions	Number of Teachers who Participated
Assistant Head Teacher	2
Head of Year Teacher	24
The Class/Form Teacher	18
Centres for the Gifted Teacher	6
Total	50

Table 3.2 : The Positions of the Teachers who Responded to the Questionnaire and the Number of Teachers Holding Each Position.

Period of Teaching	Number of Teachers
Less than 5 Years	2
5-10 Years	10
10-20 Years	22
More than 20 Years:	16
Total	50

Table 3.3: The Respondent Teachers' Periods of Teaching.

Most South Korean gifted education emphasises the sciences and mathematics, and the questionnaire results reflected this situation as 38 schools out of 50 had sciences gifted education and 28 of the 50 schools had gifted mathematics classes. Only 2 schools reported in having gifted classes other than in the sciences and mathematics.

In South Korea, gifted education starts from the third grade in elementary school (MOEHRD, 2005). Through this questionnaire, it was found that 40 out of 50 schools had gifted provisions in third to fourth grades. 49 schools of the 50 schools had provisions for fifth to sixth graders. Out of the 6 Centres for the Gifted, all of them had provisions for gifted education for students from middle schools.

b. Teachers' Opinions on Leadership

In Questionnaire I, questions 3 to 8 were regarding the teachers' perspectives on leadership. Firstly, in order to establish the a rough estimation of the population of gifted students with leadership qualities in Korea, the teachers were asked to estimate the percentage of gifted students that they teach who also currently seem to have leadership skills in question 3. As it

is shown in the following table and figure (refer to Table 3.4 and Figure 3.2), 12 out of the 50 teachers believed that 10% of the gifted students possessed leadership skills. Another 12 out of 50 teachers believed that 15-20% of the gifted students had leadership skills. Overall, 24 of the teachers all expressed that at least 10-20% of the gifted children had leadership skills. 60% of the teachers thought that 10-30% of the gifted pupils had the potential to become leaders. Thus, it can be seen that the Korean gifted teachers observed that there is a small minority of students who were distinctly leadership gifted as well as being gifted in another academic subject.

Estimated Percentage of Leadership Gifted Students in Every Gifted Class	Number of Teachers
1%	4
5%	4
7%	2
10%	12
15-20%	12
30%	6
50%	2
60%	2
80%	2
100%	2
No Answer Given	2

Table 3.4: Teachers' Estimated Percentages of Leadership Gifted Students in Every Gifted Class.

Secondly, the need for a separate distinction between gifted and leadership gifted students was asked to understand how the Korean gifted teachers would want to carry out leadership education for the gifted students. When asked in question 6 whether the teachers would prefer it if the leadership gifted children were distinguished, 18 of the 50 teachers were positive about the concept but the remaining 32 teachers, or the 64% of all the teachers were against the idea. In other words, 64% of the teachers did not believe that the identification of children as gifted within the concept of leadership was valid one. Thus, it can be concluded that the majority of the teachers believed that in terms of the conveniences of teaching, leadership gifted students need not be separately distinguished.




Figure 3.2: The Estimated Percentage of Gifted Students with Leadership Skills

Thirdly, the teachers’ perspectives on leadership and leadership traits were investigated in questions 4 and 5 (refer to Appendix VI). Teachers generally understood ‘leadership’ as having numerous definitions, but they believed that the skills that are necessary for a leader were problem solving skills, ability to persuade, ability to lead a group and creativity. In addition, the teachers gave 60 answers for the main traits of leaders but the few which were mentioned the most (in the order of popularity) include good human relationships, good naturedness, sociability, efficiency, cheerfulness, creativity, ability to think of and listen to others, and ability to express themselves to others. These traits are similar to the traits found in much of the leadership education literature (refer to Chapter 2.2.2).

Fourthly, in order to find out if the teachers believed that leadership education would impact the development of leadership skills in a student, the teachers were asked whether they believed leaders were born or made, in questions 7 and 8. 4 of the 50 teachers believed that leadership skills were innate and therefore leaders were born. 22 of the 50 teachers thought that leaders were made. 24 teachers believed that although leadership skills were innate to a certain extent, they could be developed through training. Thus, 46 teachers, or 92% of the teachers thought that leadership skills should be taught in order for its development, thus highlighting the importance of conducting leadership education.

Fifthly, in order to find out how many teachers believed in the need for a leadership gifted education, the teachers were asked whether they believed leadership gifted education to be necessary in Questionnaire II, questions 10 and 11. The majority (68%) of the teachers expressed that leadership education was needed to be taught in schools. They believed that leadership development programmes were needed to train the gifted students so that they would be able to carry out their responsibilities as social constituents. They also felt that leadership development was needed so that great leaders would be formed to aid the national economy. This is in keeping with the views of Foster and Silverman (1988) who stressed the need for schools to fully understand the basics of leadership so that school education should be combined with leadership education.

c. Teachers' Perspectives on Leadership Education Curricula and Programmes

In this section, the teacher responses in terms of the present Korean leadership and gifted curricular situation and methods of leadership education will be summarised and discussed.

Firstly, to have a clearer view of the current Korean situation in terms of leadership education, the teachers were asked to illustrate the current leadership education situations in various schools that the teachers were teaching at in Questionnaire I, question 9 and Questionnaire II, questions 1-3. It was found that only 1 out of 50 schools reported teaching leadership education from an independent curriculum whilst 9 out of 50 schools stated that they merged leadership training with other subjects such as mathematics, humanities, all subjects, and activities other than academic subjects. One school teacher wrote that they combined leadership education with summer holiday camps. The remaining 40 schools admitted that they do not have a curriculum or any training for leadership development. Thus, this shows the utter lack of leadership education in Korean schools presently despite the majority of the teachers expressing the need for it (refer to the previous section).

Secondly, for the schools which were using leadership programmes or curricula, the teachers' opinions on the strengths, weaknesses and the suitability of the curricula or programmes they were using for leadership training were asked in Questionnaire II, questions 2 and 7. The answers can be summarised as follows:

Advantages	Disadvantages
Leadership education can be conducted as a	The nature of the curriculum is not systematic,

part of other subjects such as mathematics and the sciences.	coherent or organised.
Detailed real-life examples are used and are therefore practical and realistic.	There is not a specific curriculum for leadership development and is often included in various activities.
The programme/curriculum focuses on the development of logical thinking skills.	A leadership programme is needed because currently in Korea, the emphasis of gifted education is in the sciences and mathematics which does not focus on the development of creativity.
The fact that there is a set content in the curriculum is good.	The leadership curriculum does not involve moral education and does not develop social and emotional aspects.
It encourages group work when problem solving.	

Table 3.5: A Table to Show the Advantages and Disadvantages of the Current Leadership Curricula or Programmes used in Korea.

Overall, although the current curricula or programmes had some advantages, some teachers expressed a serious lack and the need for a systematic and practical independent leadership curricula or programmes in schools.

Thirdly, to have a better understanding of how to improve the current leadership curricula or programmes, Questionnaire II, question 3 invited the teachers to suggest any ideas that they believed needed to be added for improvement. Their answers can be summarised as:

- Korean curricula are very theoretical. Thus, more research should be done by the educationalists to develop more realistic and practical curricula.
- More directions, strategies or guidelines for teachers of gifted students would be useful.

Fourthly, in order to practically formulate the essential themes and skills that are needed for leadership gifted students, the teachers were asked to specifically name various components which they believed should be included in a leadership development curriculum or programme in Questionnaire II, question 9 and Questionnaire III, question 2. The responses can be organised into four categories as follows:

Summarised Categories	Suggested Components
Self-development	Personal Qualities: diligence, self-control, independent skills, positive mentality, efficiency.
Social & Emotional Development	Communication Skills: logic, written communication, speech communication (high verbal skills), knowledge of methods of self-expression of one's own opinions. Social Skills: consideration for others, understanding others, ability to accept others, social relationship skills, counselling skills, open mindedness, development of emotional intelligence, emotional stability, respect for others.
Moral Development	Moral education: ethical training, earnestness, character building education, understanding values.
Leadership Development	Skills: logical thinking, decision making, problem solving, distribution of roles in teams, ability to lead and command, time management skills, counselling skills, ability to analyse situations, ability to encourage group members for unity, skill to lead and organise events. Knowledge: education for one's own specialist area, enjoyment in reading, knowledge in psychology and economy, basic understanding of leadership, patriotism, knowledge about and the ability to evaluate governmental decisions, learning about duties and responsibilities of being a leader.

Table 3.6: Summarised Categories and Suggested Components of Leadership Development Curriculum or Programme.

In analysing the replies of teachers on the contents of leadership gifted curriculum to prepare the gifted to be equipped with leadership skills, four categories were formed: self-development, social and emotional development, moral development and leadership development. This categorical framework has been formulated by the author with some adaptations from Parker's (1983) Leadership Training Model (refer to Chapter 4).

In addition, the above responses of the teachers can also be put into pre-formed categories by Kim, Jun and Kim (2005), which they formed through a review of literature (meta analysis)

from 100 international articles, newspaper articles and books on leadership. From the resources, they found 159 skills and abilities leaders should possess, which they organised into 20 categories. These categories were used in grouping the teacher responses of this research, and its frequencies in occurrences were counted in Table 3.7:⁸

Suggested Components of Leadership Development Curriculum/Programme in the Order of Importance ??	Percentage
1. Morality and Personality: honesty, fairness, conscience, reasonableness, trustworthiness, model of others	17.3%
2. Consideration and respect for others: understanding of others, tolerance, concerns and respect, kindness, sensitivities to others' emotions	13%
3. Intellectual powers: reading abilities, psychology, business administration	13%
4. Communication ability: listening to others' talks, communication skills, speech skills, expression ability, clear communication, opinion presentation skills	10%
5. Personal relationships skills: sociality, gathering together with others	10%
6. Problem solving power: situation analysing power, reasonable thinking power, subject identifying and task solving power, logical thinking power	8%
7. Professionalism: professionalism of each field, counselling ability, leader's role, noble character, education to improve leadership	8%
8. Responsibility of task: loyalty, integrity, diligence	4%
9. Cooperation and teamwork: cooperative spirit, team spirit, division of team role, team control	4%
10. Vision and goal presentation: it includes vision for the country, even such as patriotism, nationalism, etc.	2%
11. Organising and administrating power: event planning ability, planning and organising power of programme or camping activities	2%
12. Self control and managing power: stress management, time management, sense of balance of diverse roles	2%
13. Charismatic power: commanding leadership	2%

Table 3.7: Suggested Components of Leadership Development Curriculum or Programme by the Teachers in the Order of Importance.

In summary, in the aforementioned teachers' views on the foremost contents which future leaders should be taught are morality and character-building education as 17.3% of the teachers believed that they should be taught to leadership gifted students. This is closely followed by consideration and respect for others as well as intellectual sections, both of which 13% of teachers believed were important to include in a leadership gifted curriculum. In this sense, when suggestions for a model leadership development curriculum for the gifted is formulated, these aspects will be incorporated; morality and character-building education will also be dealt

with in detail (refer to Chapter 4).

Finally, to establish the teachers' understanding of the purpose of gifted education, they were asked to list their belief of the aims of gifted education in Questionnaire II, question 12 and Questionnaire III, question 7. Their answers are summarised as below.

The goal of gifted education	Percentage
1. Return or contribution of gifted talents to society	29.2%
2. Achievement of self-actualisation	21%
3. Upbringing leaders of society	19.5%
4. Development of individual latent talents	14.6%
5. Nurturing of human resources	9.7%
6. Development of creativity	9.7%
7. Development of innate talents	2.4%
8. Satisfaction of intellectual desire	2.4%

Table 3.8: A Table to Show What the Teachers believe the Goals of Gifted Education to be.

The most popular aim of gifted education in the beliefs of Korean gifted teachers was to return or contribute the gifted talents to society for the future development of the country as 29.2% of the teachers believed this to be the main goal of gifted education. However, this opposes the common Western thought that gifted education should be given for the self-actualisation and satisfaction of intellectual desire the gifted children have by maximising the development of their talents (K. W. Jun, 2000, p. 5).

It is also interesting to note that the third most popular aim of gifted education (at 19.5% of the participant teachers) was to bring up leaders of society. In other words, leadership has a strong relationship with gifted education in Korean culture, as the teachers trust that the gifted will be leaders of the country when growing up. This concept is being reflected in those who provide education for the gifted, which denotes that this belief must also be transferred to the students that they teach.

In conclusion, the aim of gifted education is in order to aid gifted children in their process of self-actualisation and self-development of their potentials and to simultaneously prepare them for future social and national contribution as leaders. This is to become a good leader who can contribute their skills towards the good of the nation. Gifted children should be identified and

educated so that their great abilities can aid the society as a whole.

d. Teachers’ Perspectives on Leadership Education

In this section, the perspectives of the gifted teachers on the hours, teachers, content and the teaching periods of leadership education will be dealt with in detail to have a more practical understanding of how to conduct leadership gifted education.

Firstly, to determine the duration of possible leadership training, the teachers were asked to state the number of hours per week students should receive leadership training in Questionnaire II, question 4 and Questionnaire III, question 3. The results showed that the majority of teachers, or 34 out of 50 teachers preferred 1 to 2 hours of leadership education every week.

Number of Hours	Number of Teachers
1-2	34
3	4
4	2
5	4
No Answer Given	6

Table 3.9: Teachers’ Opinions on the Number of Hours Students Should Receive Leadership Education.

In other words, the teachers believed that leadership training should not take up too much time in the short gifted education schedule.

Secondly, in order to find out when leadership education should be initiated, Questionnaire II, number 6 and Questionnaire III, number 4 enquired about the most adequate age for children to begin leadership education. The results showed that most teachers preferred for the leadership education to begin when gifted education begin in Korea which is in Year 3:

Age	Number of Teachers
Before Nursery	4
Nursery	4
Years 1-2	2
Years 3-4	25

Years 5-6	3
Middle School	6
High School	4
No Answer Given	6

Table 3.10: Teachers' Views on the Most Adequate Age for Leadership Education to Begin.

Thirdly, to find out the preferences of the teachers on who might conduct leadership education, the teachers were asked who might be the most suitable to teach leadership curricula in Questionnaire II, question 8 and Questionnaire III, question 5. The following was found:

Ideal Type of Teacher	Number of Teachers
The Head Teacher	2
Religious Education Teacher	0
The Class/Form Teacher	10
All Members of Staff	0
Several Members of Staff Working as a Team	2
Others: Special Subject Teacher	24
Other: An Experienced Teacher or Researcher of Giftedness	12

Table 3.11: Teachers' Views on the Most Suitable Teacher for Teaching Leadership Curricula.

The results show that most teachers believed that a special subject teacher in leadership is the most adequate to conduct leadership development education. It is also interesting to find that none of the teachers believed that any or all members of staff should conduct leadership, which supports the view that someone with expertise in leadership should teach the gifted students.

Overall, the preferences and the ideal methods of conducting leadership education of current gifted teachers have been explored in this section. As it is shown in the tables above, the questionnaire findings demonstrate that 25 out of 50 teachers, which is 50% of the teachers prefer leadership training to start during Years 3 or 4 which is when Korean gifted education is now set to start. The teachers therefore, believed that the leadership gifted course should be implemented when gifted education starts. Out of the 50 teachers, 34 teachers, which is 68% of the teachers suggested 1 to 2 hours of leadership training per week and 24 teachers out of 50, which is 48% of the teachers wanted teachers trained in special subjects to teach them.

However, in reality, there are hardly any leadership education being conducted for gifted students in Korea, and if it is conducted, it begins much later than in Years 3 or 4. Part of the problem is due to very few teachers specializing in this area in the primary sector in Korea.

3.2.2. Interview Results

In addition to the data collected from the questionnaire responses from gifted education teachers, three interviews were held to have a more in-depth understanding of the current gifted education situation in Korea as well as their views on leadership development within gifted education. Semi-structured interviews were held with two gifted education teachers and one Director of Education. The 2 gifted education teachers were interviewed via telephone and the Director was interviewed in a natural surrounding.

a. Interviews with Two Teachers

The interviewees were current Korean primary school teachers who also lead gifted students' classes in their own schools.

1. What do you think is the most urgent necessity in the Korean gifted education situation, taking into account of the fact that gifted education is recently becoming popular in Korea recently?

This question was asked in order to expand upon the answers teachers gave in the questionnaire on what is lacking in Korean gifted education. When asked the above question, the teachers provided 4 main suggestions. Firstly, they believed that in order for gifted education to develop, teachers should be trained in gifted education to prepare themselves for the gifted classes. Secondly, it was pointed out that a correct and accurate understanding of gifted students should be taught to teachers and parents. Thirdly, they expressed a need to recognise gifted education as a way for students to grow as humans and leaders rather than a way to accelerate and increase knowledge. Fourthly, one of the teachers said that there are too many pupils in one class for the teachers to teach effectively. This is the case in average classes as well as the gifted classes in Korea. Hence, it is nearly impossible for teachers to have any type of individual mentoring system with the students.

2. a) Do you have any moral education or character-building education in your school? Do

you have special programmes for moral education in your school?

As the questionnaire results showed that teachers most preferred moral and character-building education to be carried out in leadership development education, the question was asked to see if this education is given in current primary schools.

When asked, the two teachers replied that their school do not have separate leadership training programmes. One of the teachers said that in their school, the teachers individually try to incorporate some leadership education during mathematics and sciences lessons.

2. b) Do you find it hard to prepare for moral and character-building programmes by yourself?

Following on from the previous question, as one of the teachers stated that in their school, teachers individually prepare ways to incorporate leadership education in their typical teaching schedules, this question aimed to find out what the difficulties were in personally preparing for moral and character-building programmes.

When asked, one teacher admitted that it was a challenging task to handle moral programmes by themselves and resorted to enrolling into a graduate school by taking evening classes to learn more about leadership education. The teacher expressed a desire to research more in this area and is now working towards a Masters degree. On the other hand, the other teacher stated that moral education was initiated in their school, 3 years ago and they have 2-3 hours of moral education sessions per week. However, the teacher argued that this is too short a period to satisfy the gifted students' desires to know more about morality and ethics.

3. What is your opinion on whether being gifted and being a leader is the same or different?

In order to explore the relationship between leadership and giftedness further, this question was asked and the two teachers gave contrasting views. One teacher insisted that gifted students were also leaders as it was stated: "In Korea, when we think of gifted students, we see them as future leaders. We think that they are intelligent and clever, so for them to become leaders in their own fields is natural." Evidently, many Koreans relate giftedness with leadership skills. However, the other teacher believed that giftedness and leadership is not related as it was stated: "In my opinion, gifted children have a tendency to be self-absorbed, so this is the complete opposite of leadership characteristics. A leader should be able to care for others, sometime

even before themselves. In this sense, it is very difficult to link giftedness with leadership skills.”

4. What plans do you have in the future as a gifted education programme teacher? Is there anything else you would like to add?

In this question, the teachers’ future aspirations for gifted education were asked, also providing them an opportunity to add any extra information. When asked, both teachers mentioned how gifted students should be developed to become leaders in societies as the two teachers responded:

“Gifted students cannot merely have knowledge or talents, but should grow up and develop as a human being. This is the only way they will be able to contribute towards society in the future. I feel the need to help gifted students to become true leaders with good manners and the desire to serve others.”

“I would like to become a teacher who will be able to fulfil the students’ learning desire and respond to their needs. I will also try to help them to be able to contribute as a leader towards the society or field that they will be in.”

b. Interview with the Director of Education

The interview held on 20 August, 2005 with Dr. Meesook Kim, the Director of the Korean Office of Foundation and Policy. She is also part of the National Research Centre on Gifted and Talented Education and the Korean Educational Development Institute. Similar questions as the interviews described above with two gifted education teachers were asked so that a greater insight into gifted and leadership education can be seen from the perspective of a Korean educational expert.

1. What do you think is the most urgent necessity in the Korean gifted education situation, taking into account of the fact that gifted education is recently becoming popular in Korea recently?

In reply to this question, Kim emphasised the need for further research as she said,

“Since 2002, the Korean government designated and supported Centres of the Gifted and the National Research Centre on Gifted Education; however, because we cannot depend solely on foreign research results, we feel the need for research in gifted education specifically in the Korean culture and education.”

2. *What specific area of research are you focusing on recently?*

This question was asked to find out the trend in Korean gifted education research at that time. She summarised the previous research that had been conducted and the importance of leadership research as she said,

“In 2003, we focused our research on gifted elementary school children’s cognitive and affective characteristics and guiding strategies. In 2004, we put emphasis on cognitive and affective characteristics of and teaching strategies for the Korean junior high school gifted students. As the result of the research, we found that gifted students are extremely creative, have lots of interest in other people, have problem solving skills and leadership skills. This is why this year we are researching on methods of improving their creative problem solving skills, and strategies to develop their leadership skills.”

3. *What is your opinion on whether being gifted and being a leader is the same or different?*

The view of a Korean researcher on the relationship between leadership and giftedness was sought in asking this question. She emphasised the significance of leadership in gifted education as she replied,

“In Korean society, it is difficult to disassociate giftedness and leadership. We all tend to believe that gifted students will develop to be our future leaders. Although there are gifted students who are gifted only in a single area, we recognise and hope that they will become leaders in their own fields. Therefore, in the next few years, our centre is planning to search for methods to develop gifted students as leaders.”

4. *What do you think is of most importance in educating gifted students as leaders?*

When asked what she believed was most important in leadership gifted education, Kim gave the same reply as the answer that most teachers who responded in the questionnaire gave when

asked the same question; they believed that moral and character-building education was the most important aspect in teaching gifted students about leadership as she stated, “first of all, moral education and character-building education are important for leadership education. In order to contribute back to society what they received through their education, they should be able to think of others, respect people and have a desire to serve others in leadership.”

5. What kind of suggestions do you have as a pioneering gifted education researcher in Korea?

As gifted education research only started recently in Korea, any advice for current researchers of Korean gifted education researchers was sought. She emphasised the need for further research as she said, “as researchers in gifted education which recently began in Korea, those with interest in this area should work hard with a pioneering mission. Because there are so many more things to research about, those who are ready with a desire to research in this area, or those who have studied this area abroad should take charge in conducting gifted education research.”

3.3. Data Discussion and Analysis

In this section, we will analyse and discuss the main issues that were prominent in the data collected through questionnaires and interviews.

3.3.1. Korean Gifted Education Situation

a. Lack of Variety of Subjects in Gifted Education

The responses collected from the questionnaire survey and the interviews emphasise the main problem in Korean gifted education is that there is a lack of variety in the subjects they offer to gifted students. The current gifted education given in Korea mainly deals with mathematics and the sciences. Due to the lack of variety in the subjects available in gifted education, the humanities and the other subjects are often neglected (Y. E. Kim, 2000, p. 31). Such overemphasis aided the development of modern scientific technology in Korea. Although the level of teaching in these areas is not yet satisfactory, those receiving science and mathematics gifted education are receiving education that is suitable for their talents and needs. However, those with talents in music or art are being educated in independent and private institutions (S.

H. Cho, 2000, p. 18). According to research in 2003, 0.28% of the students in Korea are receiving gifted education. Of these 21,616 students, 82% of them were found to be mathematics or science gifted. Only the remaining 18% were receiving gifted education in the arts, English and Information Technology (H. E. Suh, 2003, p. 2).

Similarly, the questionnaire results show that all schools except 2 schools out of 50 schools mainly catered for mathematics and science gifted education. The reason for the lack of provision for gifted education in other fields such as the arts and the humanities is mainly because the government does not feel as much need for them as it does for mathematics and the sciences as mathematics and the sciences work to strengthen the nation's economy. Hence, any investment in the education of mathematics and the sciences is seen as a necessary action for the development of the national economy. However, as societies cannot be formed only with scientific developments, there is a need for gifted education also in the arts, music, languages and culture (S. S. Han, 2005). Thus, in the future, there not only needs to be a focus in gifted education in the sciences but also in other diverse areas. Gifted education policy must also be made to encourage a more proportionate and balanced education curriculum (Y. E. Kim, 2000).

b. Lack of Teacher Training

Another issue that arose from the data collected is the lack of trained teachers in the area of gifted and leadership education. It was reported that current teachers in gifted and leadership education lack expertise. For the success of gifted education, the professional expert teachers of gifted education are necessary (H. W. Kim, 2003, p. 112). However, the gifted education teachers teaching in institutes presently are those who have only qualified for mainstream schools. According to research in 2002, only 19.2% of the teachers who were teaching gifted students had received gifted education training (Cho, Kim, Park, & Chung, 2002). It was found that out of the 700 teachers who received gifted education training only 47 teachers went on to contribute as a gifted student teacher (S. H. Cho, 2005).

In this sense, training for educating gifted students should be given to a larger teacher population, and the teaching staff in every school should be given more opportunities to learn more about gifted education through workshops and training courses. In addition, administrative help should be given so that the teachers should be led to use their specialities to their full potential when teaching gifted children.⁹ Furthermore, self-research study of the

teachers is equally effective.¹⁰ Financial support should be available for self-research, aiding teachers to study abroad to learn different teaching methods to gain the expertise of gifted education. Permanent professional gifted education teachers should be stationed in the gifted institutions for them to have proficiency in their teaching sector, rather than to employ several part-time staff who teach mainstream children (Yoon & Park, 2003).

c. Change in Gifted Stereotypes in Culture, Society and Parental Thoughts

The data results revealed that there are some misconceptions about gifted students in the Korean society due to traditional thoughts. The general misconception of Koreans is that special needs education is urgently important, whilst gifted education is seen as an optional luxury or “bourgeois education” (S. H. Cho, 2002a, p. 202). In addition, parents of the non-gifted students fear that their children might be disadvantaged in entering higher education. Furthermore, Eastern parents have an erroneous belief that all their children are gifted¹, leading to the over-excessive attempts to further the ability of their children through private tuition (refer to Chapter 2, Section 2.1.3.a for more details).

These personal reasons partly lead to underdevelopment of gifted education. The one of largest current problems in Korean education is that children are forcedly given gifted education in private institutes since a young age to encourage ‘typical’ ability children into gifted children. Specialists point out that the private institutes have the children memorise gifted identification tests prior to taking the test. However, such preliminary learning under the title of gifted education does not help to develop giftedness and may lead children to feel inadequate or stressed. Kenny (cited from H. G. Lee, 2005) maintains that such private education may make children become familiar with entrance examinations and gifted programmes, but the children will experience difficulties especially with peers in the gifted schools and their achievements of learning are likely to fall below ‘average.’ Emphasising the need for entering into a gifted programme may cause problems in the healthy development of children. This type of gifted education conducted by private educations does not enhance the abilities of students but tends to destroy their creative abilities as they are made to memorise and practice gifted entrance examinations (H. G. Lee, 2005).

In order to prevent such harmful consequences, the aims and the processes involved in gifted education can be made aware by specialists in the field to a wider population. Gifted education institutes could invite specialists to inform the parents and students as well as help run

gifted programmes. In order to inform the Korean people about the true concept of gifted education, specialists and researchers in gifted education should be consulted by the teachers to firmly establish gifted education as a national special education system rather than a means to acceleration and entering better universities.

d. No Appropriate Gifted Programme

The participant teachers also expressed the lack of comprehensive gifted programmes in Korea. It was believed that the current gifted education programmes in Korea are not suitable as they only focus on knowledge and learning of academic concepts. Although gifted students have project investigations, they are very much theoretical and do not focus on the process or methods of learning such as finding resources, understanding the material and finding results.

Thus, diverse gifted educational programmes should be developed, taking into account the needs of schools and their situations. Gifted education programmes must also be systematic so that students can be categorised into the different abilities that they have. Hence, a curriculum must be made focusing on various ages of the children, with funding and support from the government (Gallagher, 2002).

The gifted programmes should also include the non-academic subject areas and facilities outside the school should also be used to develop the current gifted programmes. For instance, research museums, music centres, art centres, and science centres can be utilised outside the school times during weekends or holidays. An example can be seen in the Australian Gifted Interest Centre.¹¹

In addition, gifted programmes must also include some ethical teaching as well for the mental and spiritual growth to equip them in becoming the future leaders in their fields. The significance of moral and character-building education was supported by Seok Hee Cho, the director of Korean Educational Development Institute, who stated that gifted children are only taught knowledge in school, but their personal and moral development is not considered in gifted schools.¹² In this sense, moral education will be focused on in the suggestions for a model gifted programme.

3.3.2. How Far Are Good Leaders Born or Made?

The results from QTOGGLE reports that 60% of the gifted education teachers believe that only 10-30% of the gifted students have leadership skills and therefore only a small minority of gifted students have leadership skills to be developed. Many traits of gifted pupils have been found to be the same as those with leadership abilities. The common traits of good leaders and gifted students include: language skills, sociability, vision towards the future, problem solving, critical thinking, challenging new things, responsibility, and self-satisfaction (Black, 1984; Karnes & Bean, 2001; Plowman, 1981). Furthermore, many leaders were found to have a high IQ of 115-130 (Hollingworth, 1926) or in other words, many gifted children acted as 'leaders' in school (Terman, 1925).

Although there is the perspective that leaders are 'born' and therefore, leadership is innate, many believe that one cannot become a leader with just leadership potential (Kim, 1998). However, there are views that specific leadership skills can be learned (Rodd, 1994, p. 6). Renzulli (1976) believed that the top 15-20% of all students have the potential to become international leaders provided they are educated in leadership, highlighting the significance of education. In contrast, those who hold the trait perspective suggest that certain individuals have special innate or inborn characteristics or make them leaders, and it is these qualities that differentiate them from non-leaders. Some of the personal qualities used to identify leaders include unique physical factors such as height, personality features such as extroversion, and ability characteristics such as speech fluency (Bryman, 1992). There are some inherited personal attributes which are associated with leadership.

There are various evidences to support the innate account. There are three main types of innate talent accounts (Howe 1999; Howe et al., 1998). Firstly, there is much popular evidence that very young children have innate talents such as those who are able to talk early or to play instruments at an early age. However, there are limitations to evidences. For instance, the childhood descriptions of gifted children are usually made by parents in hindsight. Hence, these recollections may not always be accurate. These evidences put emphasis in the talents of the children and do not mention the possible opportunities that they had. An example is that of Amadeus Mozart who we all know to have possessed great innate musical skills. However, many researches fail to mention the opportunities that he was given through his musical father (Howe, 1997).

The second type of evidence for the innate accounts of giftedness is the existence of children who possess extraordinary musical skills such as having 'perfect pitch'. Yet, these accounts cannot be innate, although the children who have these skills are extremely young. They are nevertheless, a "learned capacity" (Howe, 1999, p. 163).

Thirdly, there are some evidences which underlines that those with extraordinary capabilities can be correlated to brain functioning. However, Howe (1999) points out that no selective brain activity is yet directly related to certain capabilities a person might have. Secondly, he emphasises that the "fact that two qualities are related is not really sufficient evidence for the existence of such a cause and effect association" (Howe, 1999, p. 163).

In addition, there has been some research in the observations of babies of different nationalities and finding possibly innate differences in them. For instance, differences in European and African babies were observed in Kenya by Charles Super (1979) whereby he found that Kipsigi infants showed motor developments such as sitting and walking a month earlier than the counterpart European infants. However, Super (1979) found that there were other motor skills which the Kipsigi babies were slower at developing, such as crawling or lifting of the head. It was then when it was found that the Kipsigi mothers had taught their children to walk and sit constantly as they even had specialised words of instruction for sitting and walking (Howe, 1999, p. 14).

On the other hand, Galton (1822-1911) who contributed much development in the research of intelligence and intelligence testing understood intelligence as being hereditary. He was very much influenced by the evolutionary theories of Darwin. His book called, 'Hereditary Genius' stated that high intelligence is genetic. Modern day psychologists such as Gage and Berliner (1988) followed Galton's ideas of intelligence and reported that 75-80% of intelligence is hereditary whilst only 20% of intelligence is influenced by the environment. However, the majority of psychologists or educators now believe that the environment plays a large factor in the development of intelligence or giftedness (Chung, Im, & Chung, 2004).

In conclusion, on the issue of whether giftedness in any area is innate or is a talent, Howe (1990) simply comments, "the fact that a trait is partly inherited does not usually rule out the possibility of it being radically modified by environmental influences" (pp. 101-102). In other words, in terms of leadership skills, there are innate and inherited skills, with leadership skills being one of them. However, there are also strong educational factors which contribute

towards leadership development (Kim & Choi, 2005).

3.3.3. Curricula and Teaching Materials

In the development of particular skills, various programmes or curricula used is very important: “Gifted skills are generally improved and progressed through education with programmes or curricula” (Karnes et al., 1983, p. 227). However, in the questionnaire results, it was found that 80% of the schools did not have any leadership development curricula for gifted children. In the remaining 20% of the schools, which is 10 schools, only 1 school had an independent leadership development curriculum. In this sense, it confirmed the belief that Korea is in need of leadership development programme or curriculum (refer to the Introduction). The questionnaire results also show that 92% of the teachers who participated in this research believed that leaders develop their leadership skills through training. Training provision must include certain programmes or curricula.

Amongst the participants of this research who led gifted programmes said that 90% of the currently used teaching materials in leadership development were activities of other subjects. These materials were said to be theoretical and impractical. The materials were not systematic either, and therefore it could be seen that a more practical curriculum and materials are in need. For instance, in Central Elementary School in Indiana, United States, diverse and special activities were made for leadership education. Every special class had a different research topic chosen every year which lead them the class to plan and research about it, often in relation to their local communities. Through practical project work such as these, the children were able to participate and learned a lot about partnerships. The teachers were able to develop teamwork, effort, problem solving, modelling, and social skills (I. S. Lee, 1995).

In summary, many problems regarding the currently used programmes and curricula were described in the questionnaire responses. According to the questionnaire results, the currently used leadership curricula are too theory based and wanted a more practical and realistic curriculum. Secondly, they believed that the current leadership curricula do not involve moral education and do not develop social and emotional aspects. Thirdly, it was found that there are not many trained teachers in gifted and leadership education. Hence, detailed teacher instructions or guidelines should also be written so that they are informed specifically how they can lead their lessons. It was found that more directions, strategies or guidelines for teachers of gifted children would also be useful.

3.3.4. Leadership Education and Moral Education

The Korean culture considers moral education as significant as social etiquette and ethics are emphasised due to the cultural background in Confucianism (Wong & Evers, 2001, p. 37).¹³ In Eastern cultures, moral education is a valued part of leadership education as Wong (2001) discusses the relationship in the Chinese context: “[China] has a long history of valuing leadership and preparing leaders on moral grounds” (p. 37). May (1971) also supports this view as he says, “The child’s education would be incomplete without moral education. Therefore some direct moral teaching is essential in the classroom as well as at home” (p. 164). He continued to add, “Some moral education lessons might be devoted to the study of famous people, especially reformers and missionaries. Suitable material could easily be obtained, many teachers believed from varied biographical sources” (May, 1971, p. 77).

It was found that gifted leaders ‘combine high intelligence with deep feelings of emotional connectedness with others’ (Dabrowski, 1972; Piechowski, 1986, 1991). In addition, gifted students tend to be sensitive to any moral conflicts in everyday life. Gifted children do not need to be taught how they can behave morally in various situations, but it could prove more effective to provide opportunities for them to search and think for themselves regarding various moral problems that they may face. There needs to be more thoughts and discussions on self-experience and understanding of morality, experience of thinking of being in another person’s shoes, helping others in difficult situations, judging the appropriate behaviour in various situations, the difference between social and anti-social behaviours. Sometimes, it may prove to be a valuable method of learning for the children to see a person modelling behaviour from someone who has a high level of moral reasoning (Chung et al., 2004).

Amongst many opinions expressed in the questionnaire, some teachers said that the schools must give moral training because they thought so many parents did not. However, 56% of the teachers believed that the moral education taught at schools were also not enough and some even suggested the development of more pragmatic ethical education.

However, May (1971) believed that moral training is related to personal human development and therefore must be taught at home as there is not enough time to teach it in classrooms and most teachers would agree that ideally, moral training is best given in the home (May, 1971). In the questionnaire, a teacher also believed that moral education was the task of the home, not

the school. However, many thought that this was not always enough. On the other hand, a few teachers thought that moral education was the church's responsibility. However, May (1971) thought that this was not ideal. Conclusively, moral education should occur both at the home and also in school. In particular, moral education should be given through everyday living whether it be in the family, school or at church.

Feldhusen and Kennedy (1988) stated that leadership talent involves intellectual ability, moral development, thinking skills, social/personal behaviours and the ability increase others' motivation. As education is emphasised in human development in Korean culture, the emphasis of education is put in nurturing the children into adults. Hence, ethics and moral education is a crucial aspect of their personal development (K. W. Jun, 2000). In addition, Koreans believe that leadership is heavily associated with morality and social relationships (Kim, 1998). Thus, in Korean culture, moral education is an integral part of leadership education.

3.4. Conclusion

The four research questions (b-e) central to this chapter have been answered through the analysis of the questionnaire and the interview results. The answers to each of the research questions will be summarised below:

(b) What is the current situation of leadership gifted education in South Korea?

QTOGGLE I question 9, QTOGGLE II questions 1-3, interview question 2 to the two teachers targeted answering research question (b). The majority of the schools surveyed in this study (80%) replied that there was no independent leadership curriculum or training in place, indicating the lack and a need of leadership gifted education in Korea. Not only so, they expressed that a systematic and practical curricula was absent in leadership gifted education. In sum, the results of the QTOGGLE show that there are insufficient available teaching materials or programmes specifically designed for leadership development in primary schools of South Korea despite the 68% of the teachers' expressing for the need of such programmes in QTOGGLE II question 11 and QTOGGLE III question 1.

(c) How do teachers understand the relationship between giftedness and leadership and is there a demand for leadership education in gifted students?

Questionnaire I question 3, was asked to examine the teachers' understanding of the relationship between giftedness and leadership. 60% of the teachers believed that only 10-30% of the gifted students had leadership abilities, which depicts a weak association between the two concepts in the teachers' opinions. In addition, when the teachers were asked in Questionnaire I question 6 whether the concept of 'leadership gifted' is a valid category, the majority of the teachers (64%) were against the idea of differentiating a group of 'leadership gifted' students in school.

Despite the gifted teachers' belief that not all gifted students have leadership abilities, most teachers believed that all gifted students should receive leadership education, and did not believe that there was even a need to categorise a group of 'leadership gifted' students in school. Thus, this implies that leadership development education should be available for all gifted students regardless of their leadership qualities. This is supported by the teachers' contention in Questionnaire I questions 7 and 8 where 92% argued that leaders were 'made' (rather than born) and that leadership skills could be developed and taught. This is further supported by Questionnaire II question 11 (repeated in Questionnaire III question 1) which also showed that 68% of the teachers believed that leadership education was necessary for gifted students.

(d) What do the teachers understand the necessary components and characteristics of leadership gifted curricula to be?

This research question as asked in the form of Questionnaire II question 9 and Questionnaire III question 2 which asked of the essential contents to be included in a leadership gifted curriculum. The answers divided could be grouped into categories. The five most popular categories were: morality, personality and character education (73.2%), consideration and respect for others (13%), intellectual abilities (13%), communication ability (10%) and personal relationship skills (10%). These five most popular categorised replies for necessary components of a model leadership gifted curriculum can be further grouped into moral, social and leadership development.

(e) How adequate are the available leadership gifted curricula and programmes for the Korean gifted educational context?

The 10 schools which replied as implementing some form of leadership education implied that it was inadequate and criticised that it was unsystematic, too theoretical, and impractical.

Moral education plays a large role in the Korean context; this is illustrated in the fact that all 10 schools which implemented some form of leadership education believed that the moral education taught for gifted students was not adequate. In addition, 28 of the 40 teachers (70%) who did not implement a leadership curriculum also believed that moral education currently taught in their school was also inadequate.

The interview results supported and gave more details to these questionnaire findings. Overall, the results showed that there is a lack of leadership gifted education in Korea despite the demand for a systematic, coherent and independent leadership gifted curricula. The teachers also expressed a clear vision of what should constitute such education. These results depict the fertile soil of the current situation of Korean gifted education in which the prospective leadership gifted curriculum/programme could take root and flourish.

Chapter 4: Theoretical Bases for a Model Curriculum

In this chapter, the following proposed research question will be answered:

No.	Research Question	Summary of Answers	Main Sections to Refer to
f)	<i>What is the emerging conclusive suggestive model from the analysis of the results, current leadership gifted curricula/programmes and theoretical leadership gifted research?</i>	The Four Areas Leadership Model was suggested, including self-development, leadership development, social development and moral development.	Chapter 4.1.1. to 4.1.5. (pp. 97-103).
		This was formed within the framework of Parker's (1983) Leadership Training Model.	Chapter 4.3. (pp.109-119).
		The contents of the FALM were formed from the QTOGLE and interview results...	Chapter 4.1. (p.94-96).
		...as well as the contents of other leadership gifted curricula.	Chapter 4.2. (p.104-108)

In this sense, the theoretical bases for the formation of a model curriculum will be dealt with in three parts. Firstly, the results of the QTOGLE and the interviews conducted will be summarised and analysed for a coherent understanding of the teachers' opinions on gifted and leadership curricula and programmes, which will form the foundation for the Four Areas Leadership Model. The theoretical framework of this model is adapted in form from Parker's (1983) Leadership Training Model, as well as being informed from the teacher responses from the QTOGLE and the interviews. Finally, the theoretical background of gifted leadership curriculum and programme formation and development will be discussed in detail in order to eventually provide suggestions for a model gifted leadership curriculum and programme in Korea.




Figure 4.1: Theoretical Bases for the Formation of a Model Leadership Gifted Curriculum.

4.1. Results of QTOGLE and the Interviews

Thus far, the replies of 50 teachers to the questionnaire and the interviews have been analysed in Chapter 3. In this section, the responses of the questionnaire and interviews which contributed suggestions for the curriculum contents of gifted leaders will be analysed. In sum, all the collected data are from the questionnaire and interview responses from the gifted teachers. Three interviews were conducted in order to assemble a more in-depth appreciation of the current gifted education situation in Korea as well as their views on leadership development within gifted education. Semi-structured interviews were conducted with two gifted education teachers and one Director of Korean Educational Development Institute. The views of the participant teachers will be analysed to inform the suggestions that will be made for a model leadership gifted curriculum in this thesis.

The Need for Leadership Education in the QTOGLE Results

The questionnaire results determined that there is a significant need for leadership training in gifted education in Korea. Although Questionnaire I-3 result demonstrate that 30 teachers, or 60% of the teachers, are of the opinion that only a minority (10-30%) of gifted students have leadership qualities (Refer to Table 3.4 and Figure 3.2), 46 teachers (92%) believe that leadership skills can be learnt, and that students should be educated and trained in leadership to become effective leaders (Questionnaire I-7). Furthermore, 34 teachers (68%) think that leadership education is necessary and thus should be taught in school (Questionnaire II-11, III-1). The strong requirement for gifted leadership education was stressed as 40 teachers (80%) replied that they do not have a curriculum or any training for leadership development. Thus, this shows the clear lack of leadership education in Korean schools currently despite the majority of the teachers expressing the need for it (refer to Chapter 3.2.1).

When the teachers were asked to describe the advantages and disadvantages of gifted leadership curricula (Table 3.5), 20% of the replies (or 10 schools) to questions 2 and 7 of Questionnaire II, replied that a leadership gifted curricula was in use presently. Nevertheless, they expressed a serious lack and the need for a systematic and practical independent leadership curriculum or programme in schools. Some further criticised that these programmes do not encourage moral, social and emotional development in students. However, some defended their leadership

curricula as they believed that group work plays the function of moral and social education while they solve problems together. A certain teacher argued that moral and leadership education are not necessary because real-life experiences are sufficiently useful, practical and realistic. However, as many teachers' answers demonstrated, there is a definite need for supplementation of the current moral and leadership education conducted in Korean schools.

After pointing out the weaknesses of the current leadership gifted curricula in Korea, Question 3 of questionnaire II asked teachers how the current leadership curricula or programmes could be improved as the teachers were asked to suggest any ideas that they believed needed to be added for improvement. They believed that:

- Korean curricula are very theoretical. Thus, more research should be done by the educationalists to develop more realistic and practical curricula.
- More directions, strategies or guidelines for teachers of gifted students are necessary.

These comments highlight the requirement for curriculum which is more realistic and which offers more practical guidelines for the teachers to follow during lessons.

In terms of what they believed the essential content of leadership gifted curricula should be, the teachers were asked make suggestions from their knowledge and experiences with gifted students in question 9 of Questionnaire II and question 2 of Questionnaire III. To those questions, teachers' replies are summarised into categories as below:

Personal Qualities	Diligence, self-control, independence, positive mentality, efficiency.
Communication Skills	Logic, written communication, speech communication (high verbal skills), knowledge of methods of self-expression of one's own opinions.
Social Skills	Consideration for others, understanding others, ability to accept others, social relationship skills, counselling skills, open mindedness, development of emotional intelligence, emotional stability, respect for others.
Moral education	Ethical training, earnestness, character education, understanding values.
Leadership Skills	Logical thinking, decision making, problem solving, distribution of roles in teams, ability to lead and command, time management skills, counselling skills, ability to analyse situations, ability to encourage group members towards unity, skill to lead and organise events.

Leadership Knowledge	Education in one's own specialist area, enjoyment in reading, knowledge of psychology and economy, basic understanding of leadership, patriotism, knowledge about and the ability to evaluate governmental decisions, learning about duties and responsibilities of being a leader.
-----------------------------	---

Table 4.1: Results of QTOGGLE on the Content of a Leadership Development Curriculum or Programme.

The above teacher responses were then put into categories formed by Kim, Jun and Kim (2005) through meta-analysis of a literature review of 100 international articles, newspaper articles and books on leadership. 20 categories were formed from 159 skills that leaders should cultivate. Table 3.7 shows how the teacher responses would be classified into the category headings proposed by Kim et al. (2005). These teacher-recommended topics for leadership gifted curricula were could alternatively be classified into four main categories, as it is shown in Table 3.6. The four categories will be briefly discussed in this section.

4.1.1. Self-development

Firstly, self-development was a major category which includes development of self-image, self-esteem, a correct set of values and self-worth. The contents the teachers suggested to the question which were in this category were: diligence, self-control, independence, positive mentality, and efficiency. In terms of Kim, Jun and Kim's (2005) categories from the literature review meta-analysis, the category that can be assumed under the title of self-development ranked 12th, comprising 2% of the teachers' suggestions (refer to Table 3.7). Other skills that are included in this category were self-control, stress management, time management, and a sense of balance in diverse roles.

However, despite the topic of self-development not being one of the most popular topics that the teachers wanted in a model curriculum (through the use of Kim, Jun and Kim's categories of leadership qualities), much of the literature in the area emphasise the significance of self-development in leadership training. For instance, Chung et al. (2003) argued that leadership development is not possible without the development of students' emotions, feelings, sociality, and self-esteem. Therefore, gifted teachers, ordinary teachers and parents should endeavour to work together to provide sufficient support for the development of students' abilities.

Chung (2003) also introduced the development of self-development in her ‘Self-confidence and Leadership Programme’ through activities such as encouraging students to present their ideas, self-introduction activities, emotion expressing training, “I can” course training, interview training, leadership development education, discussion chairing, self-control, character training, and training through drama. The significance of developing the self was further stressed as Silverman (1993) suggested that a leader should know his or her strengths and weaknesses well through participation of a leadership gifted curriculum.

In order to discover more about the self, Karnes and Chauvin (1987) proposed a self-assessment section in their leadership gifted curriculum (Refer to Chapter 5.1.). In addition, Richard and Feldhusen (1986) advocated that one must have high self-esteem and self-worth to become a great leader. Thus, self-development has been decided as a crucial aspect of leadership development curricula in this thesis.

4.1.2. Social Development

Secondly, social development was a major concern in the teacher suggestions in the QTOGLE regarding the topics that they believed needed to be included in a model leadership gifted curriculum. They included skills such as:

Communication Skills: Logic, written communication, speech communication (high verbal skills), knowledge of methods of self-expression of one’s own opinions.

Social Skills: Consideration for others, understanding others, ability to accept others, social relationship skills, counselling skills, open mindedness, development of emotional intelligence, emotional stability, respect for others.

In the light of Kim, Jun and Kim’s (2005) literature review meta-analysis (refer to Table 3.7), there were various topics which were mentioned which would be put into the category of ‘social development.’ The rank of the contents is as follows.

Suggested Topics Related to Social Development in the Kim, Jun and Kim’s (2005) Leadership Skills Categories	Frequency of the Suggested Topics Mentioned by the Teachers in the QTOGLE Results
--	---

Consideration and respect for others	14% (2 nd rank)
Communication ability	11% (4 th rank)
Personal relationships skills	10.7% (5 th rank)
Cooperation and teamwork	4% (9 th rank)
Vision and goal presentation	2% (10 th rank)
Total	41.7%

Table 4.2: Suggested Topics Related to ‘Social Development’ in the Kim, Jun and Kim’s (2005) Leadership Skills Categories and the Frequency of the Suggested Topics Mentioned by the Teachers in the QTOGGLE Results.

Overall, 41.7% of the teachers who participated in the questionnaire believed that social development should be included in the contents of leadership programmes. 14% of the teachers, ranking 2nd in the list of topics that should be dealt with in leadership gifted curriculum, was consideration and respect for others. Thus, teachers regarded social development as the most important section in the programme.

Furthermore, social development was strongly emphasised as a core topic in leadership gifted education as Silverman (1993) and Magoon (1981) took the processes of group work, cooperating well with others, and practising cooperative communication skills to be included in the programme.

4.1.3. Moral Development

Moral development education encompasses various topics such as aiding students to develop sound ethical and moral judgement, to learn to respect their parents, and to be considerate of others. Moral education comprises ethical training, earnestness, character education, and understanding values.

According to the analysis of teacher responses to the QTOGGLE, topics related to morality and character which includes honesty, fairness, conscience, reasonableness, trustworthiness, and learning from role models are the number one category with 18.3% of the teachers emphasising the need for moral-related education topics for a model leadership gifted curriculum (Refer to Table 3.7). Due to the high value teachers placed on morality and character education, morality and character education will also be incorporated in the final suggestions for a model leadership development curriculum for the gifted is formulated (Refer to Chapter 5).

Moral education is highly regarded in Korea due to its cultural emphasis on ethical issues rooted in the early foundations of Confucianism (Wong & Evers, 2001, p. 37; Refer to Chapter 4.1.5.). This is reflected in the high percentage (56%) of teachers who believed that the current moral education taught in Korean schools was inadequate despite 'moral education' existing as a formal subject in Korean primary schools (Refer to Chapter 5.3.)

The interviews with the teachers also illustrate the importance and necessity of moral education in a model Korean leadership gifted education. In an interview with Ms. Park, a gifted education teacher, (refer to Appendix IV), she expressed the lack of moral education in her school as she replied to interview question B-2: "We don't have any moral education at all." Furthermore, in an interview with Mr. Lee, a gifted education teacher, (refer to Appendix IV), he also expressed the lack and also the need for moral education in this school in answering question A-2: "We don't have an independent curriculum or a programme. However, I realise the importance of moral education." In question A-1, he further highlighted the significance of moral education: "I don't believe that teaching more knowledge to gifted students is as important as helping them to develop and prepare themselves morally as human beings." Due to the lack of formal moral education, he explained how he is currently incorporating it into the curriculum in his answer to question A-2: "during the science and maths sessions, I always try to devise ways and opportunities to improve their leadership [and moral education]."

In the interview with Dr. Kim, the director of the Korean Educational Development Institute, (refer to Appendix V), she responds to question 4: "First of all, moral and character education is important for leadership development. In order to render a contribution back to society regarding what they received from their education to society, they should think of others, respect people and have a desire to serve others in leadership." Thus, she highlighted the need for moral and character education and suggested other contents which should be included in the teaching plans to develop leadership skills.

4.1.4. Leadership Development

This category includes developing leadership skills and knowledge, improving decision making, finding creative and resourceful solutions to problems, counselling skills, logical thinking skills, technical skills, and conceptual skills. The teachers' suggestions of topics to be dealt with in a leadership development curriculum can be categorised into two subcategories of leadership

skills and knowledge:

Skills: Logical thinking, decision making, problem solving, distribution of roles in teams, ability to lead and command, time management skills, counselling skills, ability to analyse situations, ability to encourage group members towards unity, skill to lead and organise events.

Knowledge: Education of one’s own specialist area, enjoyment in reading, knowledge of psychology and economy, basic understanding of leadership, patriotism, knowledge about and the ability to evaluate governmental decisions, learning about duties and responsibilities of being a leader.

Utilising Kim, Jun and Kim (2005)’s literature review meta-analysis (refer to Table 3.7), the teachers’ replies can be organised into the following categories:

Suggested Topics Related to Social Development in the Kim, Jun and Kim’s (2005) Leadership Skills Categories	Frequency of the Suggested Topics Mentioned by the Teachers in the QTOGLE Results
Intellectual powers	14% (3 rd rank)
Problem solving ability	8% (6 th rank)
Professionalism	8% (6 th rank)
Organising and administrating power	2% (11 th rank)
Charismatic power	2% (11 th rank)
Total	34%

Table 4.3: Suggested Topics Related to ‘Leadership Development’ in the Kim, Jun and Kim’s (2005) Leadership Skills Categories and the Frequency of the Suggested Topics Mentioned by the Teachers in the QTOGLE Results.

The results show that 34% of the teachers supported the incorporation of leadership development in leadership gifted curricula, making it the second most popular category after social development (41.7%).

The teachers’ opinions are concordant with various current Western leadership gifted curricula which emphasises the necessity of both leadership skills and knowledge to be developed. For instance, the leadership programme, “Odyssey” incorporated the development of leadership



skills such as communication, problem solving and decision making skills. In addition, “LEAD,” a project to gain insight into various leadership styles highlights the development of leadership abilities. Evans (1980) in “Leadership in Action Youth Program” also concentrates on developing leadership skills through practice and experience of leadership roles through which leadership skills and knowledge may be learned (Refer to Chapter 5).

Leadership skills and knowledge feature highly in the traits of those who are in leadership positions. Feldhusen and Kennedy (1988) maintain that leadership talent involves intellectual ability, sound ethical and moral judgement, thinking skills, social personal behaviours, and the ability to motivate others. Richardson and Feldhusen (1986) also argue that a good leader is high in self-esteem and confidence, strong in accountability, sticks to his or her positions, abundant in emotions, and is outgoing. He or she is good at conversation, attentive to others’ speaking, suggests directions, leads discussions, able to write well, excellent in organisation and planning so as for group members to participate in their tasks, and makes definite goals and problems. In overview these leadership qualities are analogous to what the teachers’ suggested to be significant skills that must be taught in leadership gifted curricula.

The interview results also show the significance of teaching and training of leadership related knowledge and skills. In an interview with Dr. Kim, (refer to Appendix V.2), she stated: “As the result of the research, we found that gifted students are extremely creative, have lots of interest in other people, problem solving skills and leadership skills. This is why this year we are researching on methods of improving their creative problem solving skills, and strategies to develop their leadership skills.” Thus, leaders are to be equipped with leadership skills such as creativity, concerns for others, and problem solving skills.

In the interview with Mr. Lee, (refer to Appendix IV-4), he emphasises that gifted students must be taught leadership skills to produce contributing leaders of society: “Gifted students may have skills and knowledge but they must first grow and develop as people to contribute to society as leaders. I feel that I have a duty to educate them to become well-mannered leaders who can attend to others.”

4.1.5. Conclusion

To conclude, in analysing the replies of teachers on the contents of a leadership gifted curriculum, four categories were formed: self-development, social development, moral

development and leadership development. This categorical framework has been formulated by the author with some adaptations from Parker's (1983) Leadership Training Model, which will be discussed in more detail in the following chapter. Using the categorisation system of Kim, Jun and Kim's (2005) literature review meta-analysis (refer to Table 3.7), the percentage of teachers' preferred contents of a model leadership gifted curriculum that they have specified can be briefly summarised as:

Four Categories of Teacher Suggested Components of Leadership Gifted Students	Percentage of Teachers
Social Development	41.7%
Leadership Development	34%
Moral Development	22.3%
Self-development	2%

Table 4.4: Preference Percentage of Suggested Leadership Curriculum Contents by QTOGLE Teacher Participants.

This shows that the teachers who participated in the questionnaires believed that social development is the most important amongst others in the contents of a model leadership gifted curriculum. This was closely followed by leadership development which includes leadership related knowledge and skills which they believed was also essential to a leadership curriculum. Thirdly, moral development was also considered as a crucial part of leadership gifted education by many.

However, the weight put on moral education for leadership training in Korea may be not the case outside the Eastern world. Such Eastern emphasis on morality is demonstrated in that gifted students who lack moral awareness are often not able to be identified as gifted in Korean culture (Refer to 4.1.4). The final component of self-development was not considered to be significant by the Korean gifted teachers, possibly due to the Korean cultural emphasis on the collectivist society rather than the self, as opposed to the Western society based on individualism. As Korea culture is traditionally rooted in Confucianism the social community is believed to be significant rather than the individual. This leads to children being discouraged to pursue or exhibit non-normative interests, behaviour and skills, and instead are encouraged to obey societal rules to maintain communal peace.

In contrast, the Western culture emphasises the freedom of the individual and desires to develop

special abilities that people have (Ng, 2003). This is evident in Chao's (1993) research where it was found that whilst 64% of mothers from Europe and the U.S. believed that they nurtured their children in order to develop their individual characteristics, only 8% of Chinese mothers thought the same. Such cultural differences are also reflected in the aforementioned opinions of the Korean gifted teachers who did not consider self-development as being a significant factor in leadership gifted education.

However, self-development will be suggested as a part of a model Korean leadership gifted curriculum because its significance has been greatly stressed in Western leadership gifted literature and currently used curricula (Refer to 4.1.1). These leadership gifted curricula and programmes used in various parts of the world will be explored in the next section.

4.2. Leadership Gifted Curriculum Contents: An Overview of Leadership Gifted Curricula/ Programmes

Many leadership programmes use a group format, where groups work together to “share the leadership role as various needs arise” (Parker & Begnaud, 2004, p. x) as leadership development is generally seen as a group-related process (Passow, 1982). Hence, in this section, a six leadership programmes from various parts of the world, designed for groups of gifted students will be identified and examined.

a. The programme, “Executive Internship Programme for Secondary Students,” which is based on a situational leadership theory, is a well-known leadership programme for the gifted. It was started under the direction of Sharlene Hirsch (Refer to Chapter 2.2.3.). The students are placed as interns with key decision-makers in business, government, the arts, media, the sciences, and other related fields. The purpose of the programme is for student leaders to experience organizational leadership in a real-life setting. This is a short 5-day course where they spend four days with their mentors and the last day in management, decision-making, and administration seminars.

b. The programme “Odyssey” involves four high school districts in New Jersey, U. S. A. This programme consists of an internship in which students are given opportunities to practically experience leadership skills such as communications, problem solving, or decision making.

c. The project “LEAD” is for seventh and eighth grade students in Des Moines, Iowa. These

students are encouraged to emulate and shadow leaders in the community to learn about leadership qualities and to gain insight into various leadership styles.

d. Evans (1980) reported of a leadership programme called “Leadership in Action Youth Programme.” It concentrates on developing leadership skills through practice and experience. This programme lasts for four days in a summer school institute, where students become familiar with the characteristics of the American business enterprise system, with emphasis on agricultural cooperatives.

e. The “Leadership and Management (LaM)” programme is conducted by Emmanuel College, in Gateshead, UK. The gifted group for leadership is collected from gifted and motivated 14-16 year-old students (in Years 10 and 11), who participate in a course of study to develop their creative, analytical and personal skills. The contents of the course consist of: speech, writing, rhetoric, economic analysis, logic, journalistic techniques, scientific investigation and website design. The LaM programme of study culminate in a four day visit to Oriel College, Oxford University, where the students take part in a number of activities and put to use the skills which they have developed during the two-year course. Currently, the programme is run by six teachers at the school.

f. Karnes and Chauvin (1987) developed the “Leadership Skills Development Programme” in order to promote important skills for upper year primary school students and secondary school students. This programme is comprised of two parts; the first part is the “Leadership Skills Inventory (LSI)” which assesses the following leadership skills in students.

1. *Basic skills needed for leadership:* comprehension of leadership types and terminologies.
2. *Writing skills:* outline composition, speeches and reports.
3. *Speech communication skills:* presentation of one’s view on a specific problem, speech skills, and constructive criticisms.
4. *Values clarification:* confirmation of values, understanding the importance of free will, and confirmation of one’s own choice.
5. *Decision making:* collection of facts, analysis of results for decision making, and attainment of logical conclusion.
6. *Group dynamics skills:* role for group formation, collection of public opinions, negotiations.

7. *Problem solving*: identification of problems, strategy for problem solving, accommodation of minor views.
8. *Personal development*: confidence, sensitiveness, self-control.
9. *Planning skills*: goal setting, management of schedule, strategy of evaluation (Davis & Rimm, 1985, 1994; Song, Lee, Lee, Choi & Park, 2001, p. 211).

The Leadership Skills Inventory can be used in numerous ways as it provides leadership profiles for individual students and also provides the basis for the development of leadership programmes.

The second part of Karnes and Chauvin's (1987) "Leadership Skills Development Programme" is the "Leadership Skills Activities Handbook." This handbook is designed to develop skills and features described in the LSI. This one-week leadership studies programme devised by Karnes and Chauvin (1987) is made for students to learn leadership skills and to put them into action as the students are trained in the nine areas of leadership skills on the basis of LSI. Students are given the option to select a few of the nine areas and relevant training activities from an accompanying *Leadership Skills Inventory Activities Manual* (Karnes & Chauvin, 1987). This programme has been proved positive in developing leadership (Davis & Rimm, 1985, 1994).

Overall, most leadership programmes have several common characteristics:

- To provide for exploration of leadership
- To examine leadership styles
- To experience leadership in action
- To become aware of one's own strengths and weaknesses
- To evaluate one's potential in view of heightened awareness (Sisk, 1985, p. 50).

There were a limited number of leadership gifted programmes being used, as leadership skills training in gifted students is often a neglected topic in both the Western and the Eastern world. However, the aforementioned six programmes were discovered and overviewed in order to understand the diversity in the contents involved in the leadership development programmes. These 6 programmes were randomly chosen leadership gifted programmes. 5 out of the 6 programmes are well-known from the U. S., whereas one from the only British school that conducts leadership gifted programme in the U. K. (Refer to Table 4.5).

The 6 leadership gifted programmes can be summarised in terms of their programme contents as follows:

Programme	Contents
<i>The “Executive Internship” Programme</i> (This is a short 5-day course.)	Management, decision-making, and administration.
<i>The “Odyssey” Programme</i> (Involves four high school districts in New Jersey.)	Background in leadership skills such as communications, problem solving, or decision making.
<i>Project “LEAD”</i> (For seventh and eighth grade students in Des Moines, Iowa.)	Leadership qualities and to gain insight into various leadership styles.
<i>“Leadership in Action Youth” Programme</i>	Developing leadership skills through practice and experience.
<i>“Leadership and Management” (LaM) Programme</i> (Programme is conducted by Emmanuel College, in Gateshead, U.K.)	Speech, writing, rhetoric, economic analysis, logic, journalistic techniques, scientific investigation and website design.
<i>Leadership Skills Development Programme</i> (For upper year primary school students and secondary school students.)	Basic skills needed for leadership, writing skills, speech communication skills, values clarification, decision making, group dynamics skills, and problem solving.

Table 4.5: Contents of Six Leadership Gifted Programmes.

The results from the QTOGGLE, interviews and an overview of the leadership gifted curricula and programme, show that there are a few topics which a model gifted leadership curriculum or programme should cover. As it was previously mentioned at the beginning of this chapter, the essential themes that should be incorporated in a leadership development programme were organised into four components: self-development, social development, moral development and leadership development. This was further supported by the contents of the leadership gifted programmes mentioned above.

In briefly analysing the content of leadership gifted programmes, the topics that were mentioned in each of the 6 programmes could be categorised under the four components. The frequency

of the topics mentioned was counted and summarised as follows:

Collected Topics in the 6 Programmes in Four Categories	Frequency of the Topics Mentioned
Leadership Development Leadership-related Knowledge	Leadership skills (3), speech skills (3), decision making skills (3) Economic analysis (1), logic (1), journalistic techniques (1), scientific investigation (1), website design (1), planning skills (1), leadership styles (1), administration (1)
Social Development	Communication skills (2), problem solving (2)
Self-development	Personal development (2)
Moral Development	Values clarification (1)

Table 4.6: The Contents of the 6 Leadership Gifted Programmes and the Frequency of the Topics Mentioned.

Overall, the categorisation of the topics in gifted programmes show that leadership development, especially the leadership-related knowledge was the most popular topic to be taught (refer to Table 4.6). The emphasis on leadership skills, speech skills and decision making skills firmly supports the teacher responses of QTOGLE which also highlighted the need for students to learn various skills and gain knowledge to prepare them to become future leaders such as encouraging students to develop healthy coping strategies, improve decision making, find creative and resourceful solutions to problems, train in logical thinking, enhance communication skills, and develop public speaking skills. In this respect, the leadership skills and knowledge development is supported and highly recommended as a significant aspect of a model leadership gifted programme.

Secondly, social development was a major concern in both the programmes and the participating teachers. The topic of social development had been the highest ranking area that the Korean gifted teachers believed was necessary in educating the leadership gifted (Refer to 4.1.1). This is supported by various leadership gifted curricula naming communication skills and problem solving as being a significant aspect of leadership gifted education. Thus, the strong Korean teachers' view that social development is a crucial, together with the emphasis put on social skills in various leadership gifted programmes, it can be concluded that social skills such as communication skills, open mindedness, consideration for others, understanding

others, ability to accept others, social relationship skills, and counselling skills should be actively incorporated into the model leadership gifted curriculum.

Thirdly, self-development was emphasised in the current leadership gifted programmes as personal development was mentioned in two programmes. In terms of the Korean teacher responses, self-development was not considered to be a significant area for the development of leadership in gifted students. However, as it was mentioned previously, this may be due to the Eastern culture's emphasis on the community rather than the self (refer to 4.1.5). Furthermore, the need for self-development was accentuated in the leadership literature as leadership may not be developed if the student's emotions, sociality and self-esteem are not nurtured alongside leadership education (Chung et al., 2003; Refer to 4.1.1). In other words, leadership gifted curricula should include ways in which to develop self-image, self-esteem, self-worth and a set of values.

Finally, moral development was only mentioned by one leadership gifted programme, which was in contrast to the Korean gifted education teachers who believed that moral education was an essential element of leadership gifted education. This may again be due to the cultural differences as Eastern culture traditionally emphasises the importance of moral and ethical education (Refer to 4.1.4). Despite the lack of attention given in the Western leadership gifted curricula to moral education, moral education should be firmly placed within the framework of a model leadership curriculum as the target population will be gifted students in the Korean context. Consequently, the Korean gifted children in leadership education should be supported to achieve a healthy set of values, know the difference between right and wrong, develop decisiveness, cultivate healthy habits, develop fair ethical and moral judgement, learn to respect their parents, and to respect others.

4.3. Parker's (1983) Leadership Training Model

4.3.1. Four Areas Leadership Model Based on Parker's (1983) Leadership Training Model

"For many years I have contended that the major goal of gifted programmes should be leadership development. ... I do firmly believe that our intellectual gifted citizens have the potential to become outstanding leaders if they are properly trained" (Parker, 2004, p. 10).

The Leadership Training Model for gifted students designed by Parker (1983), who first published the Leadership Training Model (LTM) in 1983 and later introduced it as a fundamental model for gifted programme development (1989), consists of four areas: *cognition*, which includes research and exploration skills; *interpersonal communication*, including self-consciousness, cooperation, and conflict solving; *problem solving*, including creative thinking; and *decision making*. Parker (1983) holds that leadership skills will be cultivated in the gifted student if the four skills are used in a leadership programme and developed in the gifted students. The four components with activities of Leadership Training Model (LTM) by Parker (1983) can be summarised as below:

<p>Cognition</p> <p>Exploration Specialization Investigative skill training Research Decision Making</p>	<p>Interpersonal Communication</p> <p>Self-realization Self-consciousness Empathy Cooperation Conflict Resolution Trouble Settling</p>
<p>Problem Solving</p> <p>Problem perception and definition Incubation Creative Thinking Analysis Evaluation Implementation</p>	<p>Decision Making</p> <p>Independence Self-confidence Responsibility Task Commitment Moral Strength</p>

Table 4.7: The Leadership Training Model (Parker & Begnaud, 2004, p. 11).

Interestingly, Parker and Begnaud (2004) claim that the items on the left correspond to the activities of the left brain (cognition and problem solving) while the right items are the activities of the right brain (interpersonal communication and decision making). The antithesis between cognitive versus affective is defined by Bloom (1974). Cognition and problem solving are mainly 'cognitive components' while interpersonal communication and decision making are 'affective.' Leaders are strongly recommended to be equipped with both cognitive and affective components (Parker & Begnaud, 2004, p. 12). Parker provides the LTM as a foundation for curriculum planning for teachers to modify and use each academic unit in school. Although the academic units were designed for the subjects of general leadership for summer

enrichment programmes, they have been modified for classroom use.

By utilising and adapting Parker’s (1989) Leadership Training Model mentioned above, and by analysing the suggestions for leadership development in Chapter Three of this thesis, a modified table of four areas has been formulated. The four areas mentioned in Table 4.7 have been made in consultation with the participating teachers’ answers to Question 9 in Questionnaire II (refer to Chapter 3), and with important qualities of leaders, as suggested in the literature.

<p style="text-align: center;">Self-development</p> <p>Cultivating self-esteem and confidence Positive view and attitude to self-concept Building personal qualities Intrapersonal promotion</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Social Development</p> <p>Interpersonal relationship Empathy Cooperation</p>
<p style="text-align: center;">Leadership Development</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><i>Skills</i></p> <p>Problem solving skills Logical and creative thinking skills Decision making skills Speech skills: verbal skills, communication skills, technical skills, conceptual skills.</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><i>Knowledge</i></p> <p>Knowledge in specialist areas such as counselling, psychology, economy, time management, and leadership.</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Moral Development</p> <p>Clarification of values Character education Religious education Moral education Ethical training Duties and responsibilities Formation of the criterion of good and evil</p>

Table 4.8: Four Areas Leadership Model (FALM). An adapted and developed version of Parker’s (1983) Leadership Training Model.

The following four sections will describe the four areas in detail as well as expressing their importance in the context of leadership gifted curricula.

a. Self-development

“When self-awareness has been built and self-concept has been developed to a healthy and realistic level, the individual can begin to be sensitive to others in the group” (Parker & Begnaud, 2004, p. 25).

Parker and Begnaud (2004) believe that it is first through self-awareness that leaders can begin to have a true self-concept to understand and care for others as leaders. It is through the growth of oneself that humans can live their own independent lives as well as in concern for others.

Self-development can be enhanced through various ways:

1. Self-confidence and self-esteem is cultivated through attempting to understand oneself. It is necessary for leaders to have self-confidence with which leaders courageously act according to their beliefs and with self-conviction. (Richardson & Feldhusen, 1986).
2. It is by searching for a self-image that leaders develop positive self-concepts and self-worth. The students should check their level of self-concept (refer to Chapter 5) in order to develop their holistic self-image. Through this process, the students will be able to understand the strengths and weaknesses of their personalities.
3. Self-development also includes improving personal qualities. It is through the self-exploration process that one develops qualities such as diligence, earnestness, self-control, and independence.
4. Intrapersonal self-development involves self-understanding, the abilities to grasp a sense of self, evaluate their strengths and weaknesses, discover their specialties, and handling concerns. Intrapersonal development involves making certain decisions and carrying out them, working independently, self-control, setting goals, achieving goals, initiating work, assessing, evaluating, planning, organising, introspection and, understanding the self (Davis & Rimm, 2001).

b. Social Development

“One of the primary characteristics of good leaders is made through the well-rounded relationships with others,” (Parker & Begnaud, 2004, page unknown). Gifted students should be equipped with leadership skills such as social skills and communication skills (Parker & Begnaud, 2004). Forming and maintaining interpersonal relationships requires the ability to understand and relate to others; in other words, it is the ability to interpret others’ behaviours (Chung, 2003). Social development occurs in children as they resolve problems with empathy and cooperation with others (Parker & Begnaud, 2004).

Formation of Interpersonal Relationships

In order to develop interpersonal relationships, group learning is the most effective learning method to develop leadership (Kenny, 1995). The research of Johnson (1981) and Slavin (1983) demonstrates that group learning promotes social development in all year groups, and results in more effective social relationships amongst students. Through group learning situations, students begin to develop group study strategies, methods of effective communication, methods of forming trusting relationships, effective methods of conflict resolution, providing leadership within the group, and learning to accept individual differences within the group.

Learning in either heterogeneously or homogeneously organised groups profits leadership gifted students because they are given the opportunity to mix with students who either have different interests and abilities, a situation that may not come about ordinarily, and the chance to socialise with students with related interests and of similar ability level. In particular, heterogeneously organised groups construct environments which forces students to recognise the differences between individuals and appreciate these as special facets of one another. This is particularly useful in the Korean educational context where individual differences are not valued but curbed by societal expectation.

Group learning techniques are further supported by developmental research. Bisland et al. (2004) stated that personal relationship skills are very important in child development. During early years of development, children learn personal relationship skills through group play; when older, they learn it by attending clubs or special activities and through socialising with others including group leaders. Through these activities, children learn how to maintain effectual social relationships by learning to be sensitive to others' needs (Laney, 2002). Group learning in school settings offers the older children with the opportunity to develop social skills.

c. Moral Development

A leader's sense of values, philosophy, ethics and morals are importantly fashioned, stipulated, and influenced by socialisation in various groups. Their values and morals are significant as a leader's guiding philosophy helps to determine the outlook of an organisation's efficiency, efficacy, harmony and satisfaction (Kim et al., 2005). Education of morality and values in gifted students is essential in their development as future leaders as Parker and Begnaud (2004) believed that they may lead others inappropriately or incompetently without moral guidance (Parker & Begnaud, 2004). Leadership without ethics may lead to corruption and degeneration,

whilst leadership with ethics contributes to humanitarianism (Silverman, 1994). Thus, it is necessary for leadership gifted students to develop knowledge on values, ethics, and philosophical systems (Silverman, 1994). It is vital in leadership education to include ethical issues to teach moral and ethical priority to future leaders (Silverman, 1993). May (1971) and Silverman (1993) suggested that biographies and autobiographies are ideal resources to help the students to learn about important value systems.

Clarification of Values

Education in clarification of values within leadership gifted programmes aims to encourage students to have their own values. This education would aid them to develop their desirable behaviours such as having a good work ethic and utilising their own judgments. Clarification of values should help those who are confused as to what their values are as it helps students to work towards goals. It eventually leads students to moral education which helps students to choose the values that they want to pursue. Hence, as it effectively promotes autonomous morality as many students can participate in the class to discuss themes concerning moral problems and they can establish their moral values by themselves. It aims to nurture and develop their mental attitudes to ultimately control their own behaviour and to have good judgment in seeing through life.

Character Education

Character education is currently debated in the literature, especially in the U. S., as character training has been required in school curricula as a result of the 'No Child Left Behind Act' (2002). It is believed that a person's character is significant in the sense that it shapes how a person relates to others and can also greatly improve mental and physical health as those who have an adaptive character are well-balanced in mental and physical health, which in turn improves the quality of life and enjoyment in life (Guon, 2003). Thus, character education concerns the development of moral values, personal character, character ethics and moral specific qualities. The main aim of character education is to encourage students to have moral judgement and understanding; it can help them to become more responsible, mature, morally autonomous leaders and members of the community (May, 1971). In this sense, the leadership gifted should be given character training so that they can train themselves to be introspective, understand one's goals, and have concern for others amidst living in a busy globalised and information-oriented generation.

Religious Education

May (1971) argues that moral education should also include religious education as education is “incomplete without religious education” (May, 1971, p. 111). This is because religious education, combined with moral education cultivates a sense of justice, understanding of promises, respect for others and cooperative activities (Wright, 1985), which are characteristics which would benefit all students. Thus, the “spiritual development of the pupils is essential to their total development” (May, 1971, p. 109). In addition, religious education could aid those with leadership abilities and are likely to become leaders in the future as it will help discern the duties and responsibilities as a leader. According to William (1990), an ethical leader has wisdom of how to successfully combine moral inference and decision making; the ethical leader who displays ethical leadership is the leader who respects human dignity, has a definite sense of values and is committed to an organisation.

d. Leadership Development

In developing one’s leadership potential, various skills and knowledge related to leadership and leadership responsibilities should be taught.

Leadership Skills

There are diverse leadership skills that leaders should possess including communication, thinking and problem solving skills. Communication skills involve methods of self-expression of one’s own opinions. This skill entails an ability to exchange personal thoughts, messages, and information. Communication is the process to share in knowledge, interests, attitudes, opinions, emotions, and thoughts with others (Kim, Jun & Kim, 2005). It is important that a leader should have and become trained in speech skills such as verbal skills and reading comprehension skills, technical skills including abilities to operate for specialised activities and to deal with computers, and conceptual skills such as abilities to analyse, to think logically and creatively, and to infer. Leaders should also develop creative thinking skills and problem solving skills to investigate, analyse, and evaluate problems, in order to cope with them and to solve them; this is because a leader would have to strengthen their decision making skills to choose and to make important decisions which may be influential.

Leadership-related Knowledge

Each leader should be equipped with knowledge in a specialist area, and become educated in one's own specialist area to become a leader in that area. It is also useful for them to gain other knowledge, should they have a social leadership role, such as the knowledge about leading others, distribution of roles in teams, counselling skills, and basic understanding of psychology, economy, and time management. He or she should also be well versed in the knowledge of holistic, theoretical, and basic leadership as well as be able to learn the origin, necessity, types, characteristics, and qualities of leadership (Kim & Choi, 2005). In addition, as leaders, students must have the ability and the knowledge to lead and to command a team of people, distribute roles in the teams. They must also prepare for sufficient knowledge to lead team of people in camp situations or other group situations.

It is necessary for future intelligent and gifted social leaders of societies to be given opportunities to develop one or many areas of practical knowledge. Provision of motivation, attitudes, and dispensation for creative productions as well as thinking skills and problem solving skills are necessary to promote creative thinking. Sternberg (1985) believed that high level thinking skills are enhanced by those with wide knowledge basis and by those who are motivated to develop common sense or dispensation for creative production (Csikszentmihalyi, 1990).

Conclusion

In this section of the thesis, a model for leadership development has been introduced and developed through describing the four areas of leadership gifted development. The four divisions of this thesis have been made with the consultation of the participant teachers' answers (refer to Appendix IV and V) and with suggestions from the leadership literature and currently used programmes and curricula. In addition to the data collected and the literature, the framework of the model has been adapted from Parker's (1983) Leadership Training Model (LTM). However, despite it being a useful framework to base my model on, it can be criticised for the fact that it stipulates that right-brain performs function for interpersonal communication and that left-brain plays function for cognition and problem solving. Although Parker (1983) developed this model due to the "popular theory that the right and left hemispheres of the brain house different but complementary mental functions" (p. 11) she also notes that such thinking can easily be refuted by a "purist [who] would find fault with this

analogy, pointing out that creativity- a clearly right-hand function- is subsumed under problem solving on the left hand side of the model” (p. 11). In this sense, the model can be refuted in terms of scientific validity as the basis for the theory. Nevertheless, Parker’s (1983) LTM framework has been adapted and used in this thesis, independent of the mechanics brain function, as it provides a clear picture of the components of abilities and skills that needs to be developed for leadership gifted training.

4.3.2. A Comparison of Parker’s (1983) Leadership Training Model and Four Areas Leadership Model

A comparison between the Leadership Training Model (Parker & Begnaud, 2004, p. 11) and Four Areas Leadership Model (which was formulated through adopting Parker’s LTM) will be discussed in detail in this section.

Firstly, a section in the two models of leadership training has similar contents; the Interpersonal Communication section (in the LTM) and the Social Development section (in the FALM) have same similar elements such as the development of empathy and cooperation in leadership training programmes:

Interpersonal Communication (LTM)	Social Development (FALM)
Self Realization Empathy Cooperation Conflict Resolution	Interpersonal Relationship Empathy Cooperation

Table 4.9: A Comparison of Interpersonal Communication in LTM (Parker, 1983) and Social Development in FALM.

The two models emphasise similar elements in this way is due to the importance for leaders to have good human relationships with group members, to cooperate, to understand each other, and to harmonise with the group (Johnson, 1981; Slavin, 1983). Thus, this illustrates how the view of Korean teachers on the contents of leadership gifted curricula (which is where the contents of FALM originated) is similar to that of Western leadership curricula.

Secondly, the Decision Making section (in the LTM) and the Moral Development section (in the

FALM) both emphasise the need for moral and character education:

Decision Making (LTM)	Moral Development (FALM)
Independence	Clarification of Values
Self-confidence	Character Education
Responsibility	Religious Education
Task Commitment	Moral Education
Moral Strength	Ethical Training
	Duties and Responsibilities

Table 4.10 : A Comparison of Decision Making in LTM (Parker, 1983) and Moral Development FALM.

As it is illustrated in Table 4.10, Decision Making (LTM) and Moral Development (FALM) are similar as both highlight the need and improvement of moral strength in students. However, moral education is seen as a small part of the Decision Making section in the LTM as opposed to an entire section being separately dedicated to moral development in the FALM (Appendix V). This is because the Korean culture values morality and character development. Thus moral and character education was also included as the teacher responses expressed a necessity to clarify values to the students. Silverman (1994) stressed that it is also necessary to aid students to understand the difference between good and evil through ethical training and religious education. In this sense, moral, ethical, character and value education has been emphasised in the FALM so that they will also enhanced in the model leadership gifted programme to suit the Korean culture.

Thirdly, the Cognition section (in the LTM) and the Leadership Development section (in the FALM) are similar how various research skills are mentioned:

Cognition (LTM)	Leadership Development (FALM)
<p style="text-align: center;">Exploration Specialization Investigative Skill Training Research</p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><i>Skills</i></p> <p style="text-align: center;">Problem Solving Skills Logical, Creative Thinking Skills Decision Making Skills Speech Skills i.e. verbal skills and communication skills Technical Skills, Conceptual Skills</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><i>Knowledge</i></p> <p style="text-align: center;">Specialist Areas, Counselling, Psychology, Economy, Time Management, Leadership</p>

Table 4.11: A Comparison of Cognition in LTM (Parker, 1983) and Leadership Development in FALM.

However, despite the similarities, the Cognition section (of LTM) implies factual knowledge (Parker & Begnaud, 2004, p. 12) whereas the Leadership Development section (of FALM) includes improvement of leadership-related skills and knowledge. Whereas the LTM emphasises the exploration of specialised subject areas, the FALM not only provides knowledge based skills, but skills which would aid the leaders to perform their roles effectively as leaders and as researchers such as speech skills and technical skills. This is possibly due to the Korean gifted teacher respondents were in need of practical training for the gifted; QTOGGLE results showed that teachers believed that the currently used gifted curricula were restricting as it did not have any practical implications and were too theoretical. In this sense, many teachers may have expressed the need for skills for practical use in the real world for future leaders.

Fourthly, the Problem Solving section (in the LTM) and the Self-development section (in the FALM) can be compared:

Problem Solving (LTM)	Self-development (FALM)
Problem Perception and Definition	Cultivating Self-Esteem and Confidence
Incubation	Positive View and Attitude to Self-Concept
Creative Thinking	Building Personal Qualities
Analysis	Intrapersonal Promotion
Evaluation	
Implementation	

Table 4.12: The Comparison of LTM (Parker, 1983) and FALM.

In the final sections of the models, there are distinct differences as in the LTM as creative thinking belongs in the Problem Solving section whereas in the FALM, creative thinking skills was also included in the Leadership Development. On the other hand, in the FALM, problem solving skills are placed in the Leadership Development Skills section and the FALM deals with Self-development as an independent section. The reason why the Self-development section (in the FALM) is divided separately is because the literature emphasised that it is a prerequisite for leaders to know the importance and the weaknesses of themselves in preparation for their leadership in society (Silverman, 1993). When leaders are encouraged to understand and to know more about themselves, they can help other team members, accurately judge various problems that they come across as well as aid leaders to have self-confidence. Richardson and Feldhusen (1986) believed that good leaders should have self-worth as well as self-confidence. In this way, self-development is separately dealt with in leadership growth training in the FALM.

4.4. Conclusion

A major objective in leadership programmes is to provide the students opportunities to function as future leaders and to develop their leadership abilities (Sisk, 1985). This section successfully answered the research question in the sense that a conclusive and suggestive leadership development model (FALM) has been formed for the development of leadership abilities, from the analysis of the teachers' opinions, an overview of the current leadership gifted curricula/programmes and various theoretical leadership gifted research. Overall, the four following components of the model can be incorporated to develop a curriculum for implementation in the Korean educational context:

1. Self-development

2. Social development
3. Moral development
4. Leadership development

These areas will be developed and discussed in more depth in the following chapter to provide effective structural and practical suggestions for researchers to shape a leadership gifted curriculum, appropriate for the present Korean gifted circumstance.

Chapter 5: A Study of the Four Areas of Development for Leadership

This part of the thesis is comprised of a detailed study of each of the four sections of the leadership development model that has been formulated in this thesis from the results yielded from data collection, the literature in the area and the various contents of leadership curricula or programmes currently available. In the next four sections of this chapter, the importance of the four areas and how the sections derived from the conclusions drawn from the QTOGGLE and the interviews will be dealt with. Thus, the following research question was answered:

No.	Research Question	Summary of Answers	Main Sections to Refer to
g)	<i>How are the suggested components of the model supported by research in each of the components?</i>	The four components of the model formed were supported by much literature in the areas, and some in the Korean context. The self-development section of leadership gifted education was supported especially by literature in the importance of self-esteem and self concept.	Chapter 5.1. (pp.122-127).
		The social development section of the model was supported by the importance of interpersonal relationships in the society, school and family.	Chapter 5.2. (pp.128-129).
		The moral development section of the model includes elements such as ethical training, character education and values clarification. The area of moral education is especially emphasised in Korean education which places ethics highly due to its roots in Confucianism. Various problems in current Korean moral education are explored. The differences between Western and Korean moral education is also investigated.	Chapter 5.3. (pp.130-141).
		The leadership development section of the model is supported by various contents of programmes and curricula for the growth of leadership ability. Various skills for development such as problem solving skills, decision making skills, communication skills, and thinking skills are explored as well as researching into appropriate methods to develop those skills.	Chapter 5.4. (pp.142-156).

5.1. Self-development

In a model gifted leadership curriculum, there should be an area for the development of the self where the students are encouraged to go through a process of discovering their personal

strengths and weaknesses to understand themselves. London (1985, 2002; London & Noe, 1997) also believed that the development of the self through understanding one's strengths and weaknesses is significant in leadership development. As Dowling (2000), and Honess and Yardley (1987) argued the significance parents and teachers on the development of a child's self-concept, the model curriculum should incorporate positive feedback from teachers. In this section, activities for self-development will be provided for teachers to follow, as a part of reviewing the area of self-development.

5.1.1. Self-esteem

In firstly developing the self, self-esteem is significant as "self-concept profoundly influences behaviour everywhere - in family, in schools, in our world" (Roberts, 2002, p. 12). McFarlin and Blascovich (1981) reported the significance of self-esteem as people's views on whether they will succeed or fail at a task is largely dependent upon their level of self-esteem. Therefore, developing self-esteem is a fundamental and vital necessity in fostering leadership in gifted students.

a. Definition

Gross (1996) proposed that self-esteem was one of the three main components of self-concept. He defined self-concept as the individual's beliefs about their personality. Self-esteem is how you evaluate and appraise your self-image (what you perceive yourself to be) and your achievements. Argyle (1972) established that positive evaluation of the self indicated self-esteem. The tripartite definition of the self-concept can be conceptualised in the following figure.




Figure 5.1: Self-concept: The Three Components and their Brief Descriptions.

Argyle (1969, 1983) argued that self-concept had four major influences: the reaction of others; comparison with others; social roles; identification. Hence, it follows that self-esteem is likewise affected by these four influences. In sum, McGrath and McGrath (2002) defined self-esteem: “Self-esteem consists of a global evaluation or judgement about personal acceptability and worthiness to be loved ... it is strongly related to the perceived views of the person by important other in his or her life” (p. 32).

b. The Importance of Self-esteem

Many maintain the significance and the need for self-esteem development in education as “self-esteem is the core concept upon which a revitalized curriculum should be based”; self-esteem development was believed to be the “prime goal for education” (Gurney, 1998, p. 78). The significance of such education is evident as the State of California in 1975 recognised self-esteem as a principle aim in education, on equal standing with maths, reading and writing (Gurney, 1998, p. 78).

It is important to cultivate self-esteem in gifted students to avoid negative results of low self-esteem, as it may be the root of 'anti-social' behaviour such as aggression and bullying; research shows that truancy, crime, violence, alcohol and drug abuse, susceptibility to peer pressure, depression, insecurity, inferiority complexes and a sense of dissatisfaction all have strong links with low self-esteem (Chung et al., 2004; Donnellan, 2003, p.29; Tyrell, 2003). Furthermore, (Dalegleish, 2002) contends that if children have negative feelings about themselves, they may display negative feelings towards others, underachieve academically, and may develop behavioural problems and anti-social behaviour.

In contrast, high self-esteem can be seen in one's own sense of value, confidence and optimism which may be encouraged by positive experiences (Curry & Johnson, 1990). Thus, in British schools self-esteem and mental well-being is being emphasised as "mental health and well-being are key themes of the National Healthy Schools Programme, launched in 1999, which encourages schools to play a part in improving children's health" (Dagleish, 2002, p. 3).

There have been numerous studies conducted to show the positive effects of high self-esteem which is useful for future leaders. Donnellan (2003) states that respect from others come from self-respect, and that self-esteem aids people to have courage to endeavour new tasks and to think and care for others, both of which are good leadership abilities. In addition, Chung et al. (2004) found that positive self-esteem in leaders generates more confidence, effort and a sense of happiness in the group members. Leaders with high and positive self-esteem were found to be more friendly and loving than those with lower and negative self-esteem.

c. Methods to Develop Self-esteem

For young children, teachers and parents play large roles in forming self-esteem (Sekowski, 1995). The parenting styles, degree of interest, concern and love shown by the parents through the children's early and adolescent lives heavily affect the development of self-esteem in the children (Emler, 2001). Although over-emphasis of parental involvement in disciplining a child may lead to negative self-concept and a lack of will in new challenges (Chung et al., 2004) it was found that for the first 4 or 5 years, parents are the most important contributor of their child's self-esteem¹⁴ (Cornell & Grossberg, 1987). In this sense, parents and teachers should support the child in cooperation "with an expectation of partnership on both sides, and with an attitude of give-and-take, parents and teachers can use each other's knowledge and understanding to support the child's learning" (Whalley, 1994, p. 13).

In addition to parental and teacher roles in a student's development of self-esteem, both their home and the classroom environments are significant (Chung, Im, & Chung, 2004; Plummer, 2001). Students are more likely to enhance their self-esteem through having friends, good classroom atmosphere, and effective teachers. There are various practical strategies to create supportive environments and to build up a child's self-esteem (Emler, 2001; Donnellan, 2003). Firstly, a child should be appreciated through parents' show of love. Secondly, students can be encouraged as a different method of providing feedback to the students in more precise use of language (Hook & Vass, 2000). Thirdly, children should be given genuine praise for good behaviour or work (Chung, Im, & Chung, 2004).¹⁵ Fourthly, mutual respect between students, teachers and parents should be maintained to foster trust and confidence (Chung, Im, & Chung, 2004).¹⁶ Fifthly, teachers and the parents should mentor the children and help the child to believe in their ability to succeed (Emler, 2001; Donnellan, 2003).

Overall, leadership gifted students can be encouraged to have a positive self-esteem through suitable educational and family settings (Schowski, 1995). In addition, appropriate educational programmes may also promote their self-esteem (Eklof, 1987; Wright & Leroux, 1997).

5.1.2. Self-development Programme

Eklof (1987) believed that it is important for the leadership gifted to have self-development training which will enhance their social understanding and knowledge of themselves. A few exemplar activities (refer to Appendix VII) which can be incorporated into a self-development programme have been formulated from various researches (Dalglish, 2002; Dfee, 2000; S. M. Jun, 2004; Kim, 2000; Lee, 1988; Moorcroft, 1999; Plummer, 2001). The four activities aim to enhance the awareness and understanding of oneself, values, strengths and weaknesses, and aspirations. A summary of the activities are as follows.

- Search for Self

The aim of this activity is for students to have an accurate understanding of the self as the first step towards self-development as a leader. The students should be aided to contemplate on who they are, their aspirations, and their abilities (Chung, Im, & Chung, p. 158). Through the activity, the students will be given a chance to reflect and discern their own personalities and

behaviour.

- Establishment of Self-esteem

Human behaviour is determined by the values held and their priority in our lives and it is valuable to identify the principles we place most value upon. Value identification and discovery may initiate value evaluation which could lead to value adjustment. Value adjustment may be the product of dissatisfactory value evaluation. For example, if a participant learns that they place more value upon success rather than effort but considers the reversal of the values as preferential, this participant may be motivated to adjust their values appropriately. Group discussions of individuals' values and value appraisals will allow participants to discover the values and opinions of others and this may serve as a further catalyst to value adjustment. Clear perception of values is especially important for potential leaders whose values affect how they make decisions and resolve problems, as the outcomes affect the community over which they lead.

- Strengths and Weaknesses

In this activity, the strengths and weaknesses of the students are self-identified for a better understanding of themselves. Such identification is especially difficult in the Korean culture as the notion of *chemyeon* (or literally, 'social face'), which comes from Korea's Confucian culture, pervades the social context of interpersonal relationships. Korean people's awareness of each other's *chemyeon* is so strong as to sometimes result in behaviour that is contrary to people's true self (Choi & Kim, 2004). *Chemyeon* is related to honour, social identity, dignity and prestige (Si-sa-yonggo-sa, 1982).¹⁷ Through this activity, the students can explore their strengths and weaknesses. Although students should recognise their weaknesses, they should maintain a positive self-concept (Chung, et al., 2004).

- Planning for the Future (Sending a Letter to Self)

It is important to have aspirations to work towards future plans as many well-known leaders usually had ambitions and realised their dreams through much effort (Kim & Choi, 2005).

a. Programme Evaluation

By following the aforementioned activities, the participant school or the group should be able to trace the development of each student. The following section is comprised of 5 methods of assessing the level of self-development in the students, using the 5 types of self-concepts delineated by Coopersmith (1967).

- Checking the Level of Self-esteem

Firstly, to assess the 'self' or 'ego,' which refers to the self-concept, levels of confidence and self-worth can be measured.¹⁸ Secondly, one's 'social self' can be examined through enquiring about one's relationships with friends and family, social skills and social self-concepts.¹⁹ Thirdly, one's 'familial self' can be explored through the level of influence of their parents' childrearing skills on their lives, the stability of their families, and the satisfaction they feel within their family settings.²⁰ Fourthly, one's persona at school can be understood through the relationship one has with their school, teachers, friends, academic study and the level of appreciation they receive from school.²¹ Lastly, one's 'religious self' can be assessed through examining how one would react should they feel incapable, not satisfied with their school or family, or if there is a problem to be solved.²²

- Checking Social Relationships

The students' social relationships can be understood through evaluating their feelings of closeness with others, their speech habits and their ability to adjust.²³

Overall, through the self-development activities, student leadership can be enhanced through encouraging positive self-concept and self-worth. Their self-development can be assessed through a self-check questionnaire.

5.2. Social Development

The second of the four areas for the development of leadership skills in gifted students is social development. Social development has long been regarded as the core of the school curriculum as OFSTED (Moorcroft, 1999) stated: "Social development hinges on an acceptance of group rules and an ability to set oneself in a wider context...children learning how to relate to others

and take responsibility for their own actions is an important part of their education” (Guidance for the Inspection of Nursery and Primary schools, 1995, p.2).

5.2.1. The Importance of Social Development

Social development is a major concern for leadership gifted students as it is evident in the teachers’ responses in Chapter Three. Sociability is a very important factor for leaders as good leadership is a combination of a high concern for task, coupled with a high concern for people, or sociability (Lame & Busse, 1983). There are some leadership development programmes to develop sociability in students which include development in communication skills, open-mindedness, consideration for others, understanding others, ability to accept others, social relationship skills, and counselling skills. The significance of social relationship is further emphasised as Lee (1984) believed that good leaders must have good social relationships. Social development occurs through relational experiences with others (Doh, 1997). In this sense, social development is a key factor in teaching typical and leadership gifted children.

5.2.2. Interpersonal Relationships

As social relationships take place between two or more people, it is necessary to have a skill to cooperate with each other to achieve a certain goal; hence, communication skills are significant in understanding one another.

a. The Significance of Interpersonal Relationships

Interpersonal relationships are significant in society, school, and family. According to Park (1985), social skills are necessary to increase mental and material productivity. As a company is composed of three elements (organisation, skill, and people), interpersonal relationships are very important aspect of working life and the increase in productivity (Han, 1990). Interpersonal relationships are also necessary for positive social development and play an important role in the function of family (Lee, 1986). Song (1987) believes that good teacher-student relationships are necessary as teachers motivate students and improve classroom atmosphere. Relationships between teachers and students may even determine their quality of education (Han, 1990).

Overall, interpersonal relationships are an essential and indispensable reality. The history of

culture can be understood as the continuity of interpersonal relationships of reciprocal dependence. If students are educated in solving conflicts in diverse interpersonal relationships which occur in the family, school, and society, students may learn to understand the self and others; thus developing into potential future leaders of society who are accepting of others.

b. Methods to Develop Social Skills

There are various social characteristics that many gifted share, which can be used for their identification (S. H. Cho, n. d.). Some characteristics include the awareness of others' emotions, participation in school-related social activities, act as leaders amongst peers, and act as a moderator when opinions collide.²⁴ Such characteristics can be developed through various measures and activities (May, 1971). Some activities include role playing, to interact with others and therefore to understand various positions; case studies, biographies and character sketches; assuming responsibility in a group; and attending talks from which the students can aspire to learn about relevant subject area. Through studying social relationships, the students will be able to understand others and to identify with them. In addition, through debates, particular viewpoints can be argued, which can help students to identify with others, make rational judgements and use evidence. Peer and trainer feedback is also often built into leadership development programmes (May, 1971, p. 172).

Overall, leadership programmes for gifted students can be implemented by utilising the abovementioned activities, as the teachers' responses in this research found that social skills must be developed and practiced in the leadership gifted.

5.3. Moral Development

Sisk (1982) cites Dewey who considered the primary and fundamental aim of education to be both intellectual and moral development. Many lines of argument converge to attest the paramount necessity of adequate moral education for the gifted. According to Park and Cho (1996), the objective of gifted education is to cultivate within gifted students their potential abilities in order to ultimately render 'development' to both society and state. In this depiction, they viewed 'development' in terms of material, political and technological advancement; they asserted that gifted education should generate individuals who would contribute to national economic development and international competitiveness. The credo underlying this perception of gifted education is that of developing individuals to promote societal and national

development; when this is assumed in practice, educators tend to overlook the moral education of gifted students. However, it is critical that we grasp the importance of gifted moral education, and through examination of the current state, contents, and methods of moral education, we should aim to habilitate the gifted with moral values through an improved moral education system.

Moral education is significant for gifted students as firstly, gifted students tend to have an “earlier understanding of societal issues than their chronological age peers” and “without moral guidance in their early years may lead them in the wrong direction” (Parker & Baugnaud, 2004, p. 28). Silverman (1994) also believed that “it is essential that gifted students with leadership ability develop knowledge about values, ethics and philosophical systems, as leadership ability without ethics leads to manipulation and corruption: leadership ability with ethics leads to service to humanity” (p. 310). Thus, leadership education should involve some element of moral education for the purpose of avoidance of future ‘manipulation and corruption’ in favour of individuals who provide ‘service to humanity.’ Secondly, “gifted students reach higher levels of reasoning at earlier ages” and therefore with moral education, they will be able to be suitably guided (Parker & Baugnaud, p. 28).

In concordance, the participant teachers of data collection affirmed the centrality of moral and character education in realising the full potential of gifted students (Refer to Chapter 3). Both Silverman (1994) and the teachers articulate the wide-held expectation of the gifted to become societal leaders. However, inconsistent with the virtually universally accepted prospect of the gifted filling the shoes of today’s leaders, the Korean gifted education displays an inadequacy and relative vacuity in moral and leadership education (Kim, 2004).

To outline, this chapter will explicate the importance of developing morality in gifted students, discuss the history and current state of moral education in Korea, and illustrate the most effective means of developing morality, appropriate to the Korean cultural context.

5.3.1. Definition

The word ‘morality’ is frequently used in Confucianism and Taoism and is therefore a fundamental aspect of many Eastern cultures including the Confucianism-based Korean culture. The word ‘moral’ denotes to what is “good or bad, right or wrong, in human character and conduct” (The Penguin Dictionary of Philosophy, 2000, p. 364). The formal intellectual

process of analyzing moral situations is called ethics, which examines underlying issues and principles in personal choices (Bigger & Brown, 1999). However, there is much debate as to what is moral and what is non-moral. Bigger and Brown (1999) believed that what is moral has to do with social norms and what socially accepted behaviour is. Willing (1990) defines that 'morality is generally the branch of knowledge concerned with how people ought to behave' in a society (p. 162). Dean (2000) also believed that children need to be taught to "follow the moral precepts which our society believes to be important" (p. 11). This is supported by the origins of the word 'morality'; the Latin word 'moralis' was created by Cicero from 'mos' which means 'custom'. This also corresponds with the Greek 'ethos' which also means 'custom' (Penguin, p. 365).

5.3.2. Moral Education

Moral classes should not only teach the socio-cultural norms and ethical concepts, but also include various approaches to cultivate students' internal individual dispositions (Kim, 1998). For instance, moral education should encourage not only social moral rules but should also teach skills such as moral decision making (Bigger & Brown, 1999) or universal values and fundamental principles, which they are to observe (Peck & Havighurst, 1960). Traditional Western philosophical understanding of morality, which can be incorporated in moral education, includes concepts of respect, justice and honesty (McCulloch & Matheson, 1995). Wright (1985) also suggested the core moral ideas as "respect for persons, fairness and justice, truthfulness, and that of keeping promises and contracts which is essential to all community life and cooperative activity" (p. 140). Much of this learning takes place in the classroom through discussions about moral behaviour (Dean, 2000, p. 11).

The importance of moral education in children has been emphasised throughout the history of mankind (May, 1971) as ethical problems faced in life are believed to be one of the most significant conflicts one can face (Naisbitt, 1999). Early moral education is particularly crucial as primary school children begin to form a moral sense by "internalising the precepts [of] parents and teachers" and interacting with others (Dean, 2000, p. 11).

Moral education is necessary for all students, especially for gifted students and students with leadership skills (Jun, 2000) as Rogers (1986) suggested that gifted students tend to reject authority and their attitudes towards traditional values and moral standards may be negative. Rogers (1986) believed that this is because they think flexibly and diversely. Such attitudes

may be worsened if their teachers or parents assume that they already have the knowledge and ability to solve problems due to their high level of intelligence as it puts pressure on them (Jun, 2000). In this respect, moral education should not only cultivate internal set of moral values, but develop their ability to resolve moral problems.

The significance of the use moral values in resolving moral problems in moral education is evident as Choi (1998) believed that it is necessary for the students to take training courses to practice resolving everyday problems in order to develop a sense of morality in students. However, knowledge of the methods to solve moral problems should not be merely be transmitted to students, but the students must be stimulated to learn about moral problems. They should be motivated to develop their ability to solve diverse problems. In order to develop such ability, teachers should deal with moral problems which occur in real life by exploring the procedures and methods of problem solving (Choi, 1998). In sum, moral education should cultivate competence on the part of the gifted students to creatively handle problems, rather than to simply transmit knowledge about morality to them.

5.3.3. Problems of Moral Education in Korea

Since the 1970s Korea has become a complex industrialized society with increasingly urbanized trend of nuclear families, individualism in the society has created a pronounced numbness in safety and human dignity, resulting in the devastation of existing social order. The reason for the current social numbness towards morality in Korea is caused by mammonism, triumphalism, communitarianism,²⁵ and performance-oriented education. Thus, Jun (2000) believed that moral education, which has been previously overlooked, must be first in priority for Korean education. Currently, in Korea, although moral education is offered to all students as a subject in school, Choi (1998) points out that Korean moral education merely transmits the moral contents. In other words, moral education in Korea simply conveys traditions, customs, and moral norms of society and state. It does not help students to face and resolve moral problems. As mentioned by the teachers in Chapter Three, Korean moral education teaching materials are excessively theoretical and impractical.

a. Teaching Materials

There are various other problems with the teaching materials in the Korean moral education (Kim, 1998). Firstly, the teaching materials do not contain challenges and they do not require

thinking on the part of students. Instead, moral education consists of detailed explanations of various values and virtues that one should have. Secondly, they do not deal with moral problems within real life situations, but the moral values are taught theoretically. Thirdly, there are no actual syllabuses which help teachers to lead debates in classes. Large classes with often more than forty five students, also hamper effective moral discussions (Chu & Park, 1996).

b. Teaching Style

There are various problems regarding the teaching styles used in moral education. Firstly, moral education in Korea do not encourage students to think and express their individual values. The education method which focuses on rote-learning transmits already-fixed and stereotyped set-values. However, moral education should train students to be concerned about the processes of solving moral problems. Secondly, the values taught in moral education are distanced from real life and thus does not generate interest in the students.²⁶ Thirdly, the rote-learning method used centres around lectures where the biased values and experiences of the teacher are taught without active participation on the part of students. Fourthly, Korean moral education imparts and enforce on students a uniform ideologies and political stance on particular topics. For instance, the knowledge about North Korea, unification, and democratic citizenship, which is also a major part of social studies education in Korea (Chu & Park, 1996) aims to emphasise a sense of anti-communism. In this respect, rote-learning education is not suitable for the modern society which pursues coexistence with the international world with diversified values. Hence, a new teaching method is necessarily sought after.

c. Examination-Oriented Education

The Korean school environment is dominated by an examination-oriented and highly competitive atmosphere in both classrooms and schools, which divert students' attention only to academic learning. Teachers and parents also encourage higher academic achievements instead of encouraging them to cultivate moral virtues. Thus, it is believed that as long as the current system of entrance examination of universities in Korea continues to be present, moral education is bound to be suppressed (Choi, 1998).

5.3.4. Contents of Moral Education

There are various views on what the ideal content materials in moral education should be (Lee, 1997, pp. 89-90). Some Western views are as follows:

Researchers	Moral Education Contents
May (1971)	social standards and values, rights and duties of individuals, especially freedom and responsibility.
Kohlberg (1972)	regulation, fairness, keeping promises, honesty, the right of ownership.
Lamme, Krogh, and Yachmetz (1992)	self-respect, responsibility, sharing, authenticity, handling conflicts peacefully, respecting and understanding others, responsibility and preservation to ecosystem, diligence, patience, unconditional love.
Benett (1993)	honesty, courage, perseverance, loyalty, friendship, sympathy, labour, self-discipline, responsibility, faith.

Table 5.1: Western Views on the Contents of Moral Education.

There were also many Korean Scholars' views on what to include in moral education classes (Lee, 1997, pp.89-90):

Researchers	Moral Education Contents
Lee, Lee, Chung, and Mun (1990)	keeping promises, honesty, sharing, understanding others' positions, respect for elderly people, manners.
Lee, Park, and Roh (1992)	perseverance, respecting others' positions, keeping order, independence, keeping clean, respect for traditional ethical values, cooperation, keeping public morality, self-control, shunning mammonism, yielding to others, honesty, manners, positive mental attitudes, respect for life, trust in others,

	responsibility, diligence.
Kim (1993)	keeping promises, honesty, sharing, observing rules, understanding others' position.
Mun (1997)	emotional stability, following social norms, basic manners.
Korean Local Gyeonggi Education Department (1988)	basic living habits (general manners, time-managed living, and budgeting), honesty, a sense of responsibility, diligence, independence, faithfulness), respect (respect for parents, obedience, love and keeping up with cultural traditions), and a sense of community (cooperation, volunteering, respect for others, public order, obeying the law).

Table 5.2: Korean Views on the Contents of Moral Education.

The Korean view of moral education contents were described in addition to the Western perspectives as this thesis aims to ultimately research for the Korean educational setting. However, it is interesting to note that the Western and Eastern views of the contents involved in moral education, as a part of leadership gifted education, is vastly different in the sense that the Western views place an emphasis on the individual (individualism) such as the rights and duties of individuals, self-discipline and self-respect. On the other hand, the Eastern culture stresses the importance of the community rather than the individual (communitarianism) which can be seen through respect for elderly people, respecting others' positions, keeping public morality, yielding to others, following social norms, respect for parents and a sense of community. In this sense, due to the Korean emphasis on moral education, and especially the community, this will be reflected in the model made for the foundation of leadership gifted curriculum later on in the thesis.

5.3.5. Teaching Methods for Moral Education

Instead of didactic teaching or subjects such as traditional values, sociological ideology, and uniform social order to students, moral education should encourage students to rationally and systematically recognise their life problems and social values and should guide them to be able to judge values in order to solve their problems appropriately. Moral education, which teaches students to independently decide and settle moral values, utilises various methodologies which

allow students to participate in the class. Feldhusen (1994) maintains that moral development should involve leadership gifted students in reading, writing, discussions, group projects, work with mentors, self-assessment of skills, values and attitudes related to leadership and real life experiences.

In moral education, the use of literature is recommended as it “encourages the development in pupils of an imaginative awareness of the feelings of others in moral situations, as well as giving them opportunities to understand their own feelings” and a chance to analyse their own and others’ characters (McCulloch & Mathieson, 1995, p. 33). The human community demonstrates moral wisdom through great stories, art, history, and biography. An example of moral education taught using literature is through traditional fables. Tales read by teachers or acting through plays students can discuss the morals of the stories. Students could find conflicts within the stories and relate it to their own conflicts. Such conflicts, which are normal phenomena, promote and constitute moral values (Lee, 1997).

Moral education can also be taught through reading about famous figures in history. A session on a specific famous character can be taught using various biographical sources (May, 1971). The Korean Ministry of Education (1993) stipulates to emulate distinguished individuals in order to promote the ability of value judgment, learn to overcome obstacles, and to apply the knowledge to their lives. For instance, students can be encouraged to reflect virtuous examples in stories; a specific virtue can be found in a significant character such as Eleanor Roosevelt (kindness), Jackie Robinson (courage), the Wright brothers (self-discipline). B. Chung (1984) believed that when examining biographies students should be led to ask themselves the traditional values of the figure, the behaviour which the students can imitate in pursuit of those values and the application of the values in present society. Students could then discuss the social ethics of the figures, “deliberately bringing out their qualities of courage, selflessness and concern for others which helped to shape the destiny of the world” (May, 1971, p. 77). M. Chung (2005) believed that this way of teaching introduces good role models into the students’ lives and it is especially effective for the lower-grade primary school students.

Moral and character education can also be taught through short stories. Students were found to be more engaged in character education when their reading draws out ethical and moral issues rather than just rote-learning (Schaefer, 1999). Reading fiction or non-fiction stories enable students to indirectly experience the lives of others. Such reading provides sharing of adventures and values of others.²⁷ Other ways to provide moral and character education

include visiting speakers can be invited to explain their work towards the society, or specialists such as social workers, the clergy, and doctors could discuss about aspects of their profession and the relevant ethical issues (May, 1971).

In sum, moral education should not only be taught didactically. Moral education should be given through practical sessions including visitations as well as reading literature to link the work done in the classroom (May, 1971). These sessions can therefore reinforce the contents of moral education.

5.3.6. Values

A pluralistic democratic society is made of people of various moral values. Thus, it is necessary for students to have moral education to formulate their own sense of values. Value education can be given in two ways: didactic teaching of existing values to students and allowing students to learn to form and select values according to the situations (Chung, 1984).

a. Methods of Providing Education on Values

In order for students to have an independent set of values, it is the role of the school not to train students to blindly adhere to certain values, but to train students to use skills such as analysis, synthesis, inference, examination, and decision making to establish independent values (B. Chung, 1955, p. 167) such as cooperation, service, responsibility, justice, patriotism, and fidelity. The Ministry of Education of Korea (1993, pp. 27-29) stated that these values can be learnt through firstly understanding the problems; teachers can encourage the students' interest in values and its intellectual background through illustrations such as news, exclusive stories, incident articles, and dramatic sources. Secondly, the students should aim to understand and apply the values in their lives; the teachers can help students to recognise the importance of applying values in life. Thirdly, teachers can motivate students to apply the values and to become familiar with them. Thus, although it is important to learn the theory of values, they ultimately have to be applied and practiced through experiences of life.

b. Values Clarification

Values clarification is a new approach to the philosophical foundation of value education which aims to provide the means to discern one's own values rather than being taught to adopt specific

values. It highlights that discovering one's own values is a personal and subjective experience. Value clarification involves the analysis of values through debates, an examination of why a certain value is important, and putting oneself in others' shoes through role play, games and various activities (B. Chung, 1984). In this sense, moral education²⁸ is to draw out or discover one's own values and attitudes. Values clarification denotes the process of prioritising of values according to one's preferences (Kim, 2003). Values clarification or the processes of prioritising values occur when individuals deal with changes in the family, neighbourhood, and school (Rath, Hamin, & Simon, 1994, pp. 60-62).

Values clarification can be conducted through dialogue, writing, and debates (Rath, Hamin, & Simon, 1994). The dialogue strategy can be used by teachers to offer students responses to help them to clarify their values. Clarifying responses are usually for individual students and can be used effectively when there is no correct answer. They should be used flexibly, not mechanically following a set formula. The writing strategy is a method to encourage students to think about the problems, and the values involved in solving it. The writing strategy encourages writing about the situation, on the basis of which a decision should be made. The strategy includes the use of a questionnaire to assess values; enumeration and evaluation of preferred values; writing letters to the people who influence the students' life. The debating strategy seems to be a hindrance to values clarification because values clarification highlights individual dimensions. Since students tend to decide values being influenced either by the dominant view in a debate or by teachers' values, debating should be cautiously planned.²⁹

In conclusion, values clarification theory is to help clarify confused personal values. The teaching method of values clarification regards values as an issue of individual concern, thought, and selection. Value clarification is an aptly recommended method to those who are indifferent, capricious, and uncertain (Rath, Hamin, & Simon, 1978).

However, it is problematic to conduct values clarification in Korean education as is difficult for teachers to communicate with many students and to respond to them in an overcrowded class. Hence, it is first necessary for the moral classes, unlike other classes, to be adjusted to a suitable size for communication and debate. Secondly, in Korea, values clarification would be criticised as 'emotivism' in the light of ethics because it tends to highlight students' personal values or opinions (e.g. "It is cute; so, I like it.") instead of taking seriously the social norms. However, since values clarification encourages students to discover their values after a deep thinking process, it is a groundless appraisal that students' value judgment is an emotive

response. Thirdly, due to the ethical and relativistic nature of values clarification, some wonder if it can be part of an effective formal moral education where most topics are didactically taught. Thus, values clarification is impractical and is therefore generally not used in Korea where the moral curricula stipulate ready-made rights and wrongs.

Overall, values clarification is problematic when seen from the perspective of Korean moral education which intends to cultivate moral judgment to decide what is right and wrong by objective standards. If students have no objective standards, moral principles, or values, but discover their subjective, individual values, any form of evaluation is impossible and they cannot be praised or criticised by objective standards. Therefore, a Korean moral class should have objective learning aims; lay down the socially desirable norms and foster moral judgment ability. If the students who are doing values clarification select negative values, the teachers should guide the students towards positive alternative values, and exclude undesirable or potentially maladaptive values (Rath, Hamin, & Simon, 1994, p. 402). However, an advantage of values clarification is that it gives students opportunities to decide autonomously and independently the values for themselves. Therefore values clarification is acknowledged to be a help in settling individual problems rather than in dealing with social justice.

5.3.7. Character Development

In Korea, character development education attempts to make students have a 'healthy' and 'desirable' character in terms of their views of the environment and human relations, and to correct 'distorted' character to ordinary one (Office of Education of Gyeonggi Do, 1988). However, as one's character is of a subjective nature, it is ethically impossible to label a character as 'distorted.' Character education can only aim to guide students to become adaptable and mature people (Nam, 2003, pp. 108-109). According to Son (1995), character education aids students to develop a sense of justice, distinction between good and evil, responsibility, moral actions, sympathy for others, and social consciousness.

However, driven by the education of preparing for knowledge-oriented entrance examinations, Korean education is criticised because it ignores character development which is the essence of education. Guon (2003) believed that this lack of character development had a negative impact on the school, family and society levels; more specifically, the Korean traditional ethics, moral values, and norms are gradually lost. This can be seen in the rapid social change due to the high economic growth, weakening of function of home education, school education which

only complies with student 'customers' who are preparing for entrance examinations and the increasingly negative influence of mass-communication media (Office of Education of Gyonggi Province, 1988, pp. 7-8).

In response to the lack of character development education and its societal effects, the Korean Ministry of Education laid down a number of practical aims for education reform (Office of Education of Gyeonggi Do, 1988, pp. 11-16):

1. Inculcate students with autonomy, independency, and responsibility.
2. Cultivate self-respect in students.
3. Foster community consciousness and respect for others.
4. Teach students to promote cooperation.
5. Students should learn fairness and equality.
6. Teach students to serve others.
7. Improve relationships between teachers and students.
8. Teach frugality and environment protection.

In conclusion, character development education is crucial as it aids students to become aware of human dignity, perform virtues, be sincere, humble, honest, diligent, and to have a strong sense of responsibility (Suh, 2007).

5.3.8. Conclusion

Today's Korean school education is criticised for providing competition-oriented, knowledge-transmitting, and imbalanced education which deviates from the original essence of education. As a result, modern youths cannot effectively adjust to the wave of rapid change and adopt maladaptive behaviours. Since such difficulties in students have become a critical problem in society, many suggest for character education to be reinforced (Guon, 2003). However, character education should not only be conducted in school. Home is the most important setting to provide character or moral education (Rustin, 1997) as the family should play an important role for children's education. However, the educational role of the family in Korea has been much weakened due to the Eastern emphasis on protecting their children. Thus, it is difficult for teachers to change the students' habits which have been cemented since a young age. Thus, some teachers believe that character education should be conducted by parents from the primary school ages for it to be effective (Kim, 1997, pp. 196-199).

5.4. Leadership Development

Many countries talk of preparing the gifted to become the future leaders (Passow & Schiff, 1989) as societies require leaders who have intelligence, creativity and critical judgement (Karnes & Bean, 1990). To nurture these skills in students, early identification and various educational provisions are required. Thus, in developing leadership skills in gifted students, the roles of educators and parents are crucial (Karnes & Bean, 1990).

There are various perspectives regarding the innateness of leadership skills. Although it is commonly believed that leadership is an innate skill that does not need to be learned, it can be argued by those like Drucker (1996) who maintain that leadership is a learned and a nurtured skill. In this sense, there is a strong view in the literature that leadership is to be learned, and is possible to learn (Drucker, 1996). Gardner (1990) also postulates that leadership can be taught and leadership development education should begin in the early years. Although only a few of the current students will become leaders of society, Gardner emphasised the possibility of producing a “substantial cadre of young potential leaders from which the next generation of leaders will emerge” (Gardner, p. 162).

The issue of the innateness of giftedness and leadership skills were further investigated in this research through enquiring Korean primary school teachers of gifted education, about their beliefs on this topic through the QTOGGLE. 4 of the 50 teachers believed that leadership skills were innate and therefore leaders were ‘born.’ 22 of the 50 teachers thought that leaders were ‘made’ through training and education. 24 teachers believed that although leadership skills are innate to a certain extent, they are developed only through training. Thus, 46 out of the 50 teachers or 92% of the teachers thought that leadership skills should be taught to be developed. In this sense, these results support the main view in the literature of leadership that it is possible for leadership skills to be learned. Moreover, 68% of the teachers expressed that leadership education needed to be taught in school.

In this part of the thesis, the final of the four main areas that are suggested to be included in leadership gifted curricula is discussed. This section explores various ways in which leadership skills such as problem solving, decision making, communication, and thinking skills can be specifically developed as a part of a leadership training curriculum.

5.4.1. Fundamentals of Leadership Development

Kim and Choi (2005) believed that it is essential for gifted students with leadership ability to have a basic understanding of theories related to leadership, such as “its origin, necessity, types, characteristics, qualities, and roles” (Kim & Choi, p. 65). Through active participation in discussion of ideas, concepts and skills related to leadership, gifted students can generate their own perception of leadership. In order to enhance their knowledge of leadership development, various activities involving group discussions (refer to Appendix VIII) will be provided as a suggestion for the model curriculum for the development of leadership ability.

In an attempt to assess the level of leadership knowledge, an initial discussion can be led by the teacher regarding the nature of leadership skills by asking students for definitions of leadership, the necessity of leadership education, types and characteristics of leadership and effective leadership qualities (Kim & Choi, 2005, p. 65). Through such discussions, the characteristics of leaders such as high self-confidence, sociability, strong willpower, sensitivity towards others, optimism, vision of self-development and their efforts to fulfil their vision can be discussed (Park, 2002).³⁰ It is also necessary for students to recognise that not all people are leaders in society but some function as leaders in respective fields of society and local communities.

5.4.2. Contents of Programmes and Curricula of Leadership Growth

As the definition of leadership and leaders imply, suitable character and motivation are not the only criteria for a successful leader. Leaders should be equipped with abilities and skills of leadership. Three skills that leaders might possess were suggested by Katz (1955). Firstly, they should have technical skills, or the ability to handle equipments and instruments to advance the knowledge and performance of necessary methods, processes, and techniques to perform specialised activities. Secondly, they should have interpersonal skills or the ability to understand emotions, attitudes and motivations through human activities, personal relationships and the observation of others’ speech and action, to communicate clearly and effectively, and to cooperate with others. Thirdly, they should have conception skill, which is the ability to analyse, think logically, conceptualise complicated and vague relationships, and produce ideas.

In order to improve these leadership skills in gifted students, question 2.9 in the QTOGGLE asked teachers, ‘what do you think should be included as an essential theme or content within the leadership curriculum?’ The following were the gifted teachers’ answers regarding their

opinion on the essential elements in a leadership development curriculum:

Communication skills: verbal skills, aid eloquence, reading comprehension.

Skills when coping with problems: logical thinking, decision making, problem solving skills.

Social skills: consideration for others, understanding others, ability to accept others, social relationship skills, counselling skills, open-mindedness.

Personal qualities: diligence, earnest, leadership, self-control, independent skills, efficiency.

Emotional state: emotional development.

Knowledge-based academic skills: moral education, education for one's own specialist area, methods of self-expression of one's own opinions, distribution of roles in teams, ability to lead and command, problem solving, reading education, ethical training, eloquence, psychology, economy, study of humanity, duties and responsibilities of being a leader.

Question 1.5 in the questionnaire asked the teachers, "what are the main traits of leadership gifted children?" Teachers' replies for the main traits of leadership gifted children are as follows:

Communication skills: sociable, interest in others, ability to accurately gauge others' opinions, good listener, thoughtful of others' feelings of others, express one's own opinion, ability to lead others, speech skills, good presentation skills.

Skills when coping with problems: ability to accurately assess information, clear opinions of self, ability to accurately assess situation, work towards to solving a task, problem solving, clear ideas, outgoing.

Social skills: outgoing, ability to get along with others, think of others first, good social relationships, good listener, ability to accept others' opinions (open-mindedness), desire to help others less well off than themselves, friendly, frank and open views, good social relationship with others.

Personal qualities: lively, empathetic, have will power, positive mentality, efficiency, creative, being leader in various activities, diligent, have concentration skills, good characteristics, have a sense of humour, desire for justice, logical, have ardour, enthusiasm for tasks, likes to lead, likes to exercise, self-sacrificial in order to find the truth.

Emotional state: sensitive, emotional.

Knowledge-based academic skills: exceptional ability in at least one area, have observation skills, bright, analysing, reading a lot, critical and thoughtful.

In questions 4 and 5, the teachers' understanding of leadership and leadership traits were asked (refer to Appendix IV). The teachers generally understood leadership as having numerous definitions, but they believed that the skills that are necessary for a leader are problem solving skills, ability to persuade, ability to lead a group, and creativity. In addition, the teachers gave 60 answers for the main traits of leaders but the most frequent answers were good human relationships, good natured, sociability, efficiency, cheerfulness, creativity, ability to think of and listen to others, and ability to express themselves to others.

Parker (1983) maintains that in order to enhance leadership skills, four skills should be acquired: cognitive skills, problem solving skills, interpersonal communication skills and decision making skills (Davis & Rimm, 2001, p. 210). Overall, leadership development programme should include specific ways to enhance leadership skills and encourage students to develop healthy coping strategies, improve decision making, find creative and resourceful solutions to problems, train in logical thinking, enhance communication skills, and develop public speech skills. Thus, in this chapter, the five most prominent elements in a model leadership curriculum, which teachers from the questionnaire and the literature in the field suggest will each be discussed in more detail:

- a. Problem Solving Skills
- b. Decision Making Skills
- c. Communication Skills
- d. Thinking Skills
- e. Speech Skills

a. Problem Solving Skills (Park, 2005)

Problem solving is necessary when a goal cannot be achieved due to an obstacle and therefore, problem solving is defined as making an effort to attain goals. It is the ability to identify a certain issue, diagnose the situation that they are faced with and to analyse it. Competence in problem solving involves an ability to identify and understand a problem, elicit ideas, analyse them, re-examine previous situations which were similar, and to form necessary groups of

people who can help in solving the situation if needed (Son, 2006). In the process, one should develop strategies based accurate assessment of the situation. Such skills can be learnt in a classroom.

Methods to Develop of Problem Solving Skills

The ways in which schools used to develop problem solving skills have been a passive affair whereby students were encouraged to solve problems by through writing on exercise books and to work through lists of reference books which were sent home to read for homework. A commonly used method was to remember and memorise various procedures that they can follow in certain situations. However, the shortcoming of this method is that those who are trained by this method are confused when faced with novel problems because they have not been exposed to them. Thus, gifted leadership classes which teach problem solving skills should integrate the practice of problem solving skills in novel situations into the theoretical learning of problem solving procedures. In order to develop leadership skills in gifted students, one should decide on the strategy of thought, explanation of strategy and teaching the strategy. Teachers also should also identify a problem or a question and expect to be collecting necessary materials for the problem solving activity in class and should guide and encourage the students to collect data to solve problems in the future if needs be.

A Problem Solving and Decision Making Programme

In this section, the thought processes involved when students solve problems in terms of thinking skills and creativity will be discussed to understand how they make decisions.

1. Creative Problem Solving Model

Problems can be categorised into well-defined problems and incorrectly defined problems (Hunt, 1994). Creative problem solving is required when a problem is not well-defined as the individual has to initially define the problem, the goal, the materials to help solve the problem and the limited nature of the materials. According to Woolfolk (1995), problem solving is to create a new solution of a problem. This model originated from Osborn (1963) and was made more accessible by Parnes (1972). Firstly, the 'fact' must be found by describing all the known facts. Secondly, the 'problem' must be found to solve it. Thirdly, the 'idea' must be found through brainstorming. Fourthly, the 'solution' must be found and the students should be taught to predict what kind of result they believe will be produced. Finally, one must

'accept' the best idea to solve the problem (Davis and Rimm, 1994). In each stage, the students should make use of their general knowledge, experience in a specific field, and creative and critical thinking.

2. Problem Solving/Decision Making (PS/DM) Model

Problem solving includes two stages: to define problems and to decide how to solve them (Park, 2005). The following table shows the PS/DM model, a detailed procedure which involves both problem-solving and decision-making:

The Process of Defining the Problem	Result
1. <i>Identifying</i> Discussing and writing down everyone's views regarding the problem and known facts involved with the problem.	Reaching the consensus of views how a certain issue/problem should be solved.
2. <i>Statement and Expression</i> Writing clearly all aspects of conflicts which are to be solved.	A consensus statement made about the problem.
3. <i>Analysis</i> Discovering and agreeing on a fundamental reason for the problem.	Finding a fundamental reason for necessary corrections.
4. <i>Alternative Solution</i> Thinking about and listing all possible alternatives to solve the problem.	Making a complete list of possible solutions.
5. <i>Decision Making</i> Choosing the best measure of solution after appraising alternative strategies objectively.	A final decision in the selection of a solving measure.
6. <i>Execution</i> Organising and executing plans for tasks, time, people involved, and resources, step by step, and taking preventative measures.	Translating the solving measure into reality.

Table 5.3: PS/DM Model

Individual thoughts and creative skills are underlying in such processes of group problem solution. The social role of gifted leaders is to provide well developed ideas and lead the discussion processes well (Park, 2005).

b. Decision Making Skills

Decision making is one of the most prominent tasks that leaders perform as,

‘Effective leaders must possess decision making skills: high moral and ethical standards and the courage to stand up for their convictions, the willingness to accept responsibility, the judicious use of authority, and the ability to evaluate at the appropriate time. Leaders must be decisive and able to reach both rational and creative solutions, to earn and be able to hold the trust of others’ (Parker & Begnaud, 2004, p. 6).

When a problem to be solved is a significant one, leaders are generally to set up an advisory or investigating committees and specialist consultations to try to find the solution for the problem. The leader can then make a collective decision through the meetings (Kim et. al., 2004).

Hasenfeld (1983) highlights the importance of referring back to previous experiences when making decisions as he suggests that when making decisions, leaders should search for the most appropriate solution by constructing a simplified model of reality, based on past experiences. Selective perceptions of reality stimulate the creative aspect of decision making which differentiates good and poor decision makers (Robbins, 1996). In order to make decisions, it is important to collect facts, to analyse the result of decision, and to reach the most reasonable and logical conclusion (Karnes & Chauvin, 1987). What separates a mediocre leader from an effective leader is usually the quality of their decisions (Varner, 1984).

Rodd (1998) believed that effective decisions are made when the following criteria are met:

- the resources of the group are fully utilised;
- time is well used;
- the decision is made appropriately;
- all the required group members fully implement the decision;
- the problem solving ability of the group is enhanced (Rodd, p. 84)

Decision making is the most important task that a leader plans when he or she organises a certain project. Vroom and Yetton (1973) believed that leaders should allow members of the group to participate in the process of decision making. However, unlike individual decision

making and problem solving, collective decision making and problem solving require effective communication. It is especially important that members have common consensus and are able to say, 'I participated in the problem solving and the decision making process.' The quality of the decision made and the satisfaction felt by the participants is higher in participatory leadership rather than in authoritarian and patriarchal leadership (Kim et. al., 2004).

c. Communication Skills

One of the characteristics to become an effective leader is the ability to work with others. However, Parker and Begnaud (2004) believed that some gifted students have difficulty interacting and identifying with their students who are the same age as them. If the main goal of gifted leadership education is to prepare the gifted students for future leadership roles, then it is essential that we train these students in the communication skills necessary for the development of effective interpersonal relationships. A leader, who has communication skills with which he or she can speak logically and succinctly of his thoughts and emotions with others, possesses a significant competence as a leader.

Communication means to 'share with,' 'have in common with,' and to 'impart'. It is related to the Latin *communis* (which is the root of 'common' or to have something in common with). Thus, communication includes a process of finding common points between people and to share it with others. However, communication is not only the delivery of a certain kind of information by means of languages, signs, or gestures, but also a process of socialisation through exchanges and sharing of a certain meaning of information, ideas, and emotions through feedbacks (Kim & Choi, 2005). Communication can be influenced by facts like intonations of one's voice, facial expressions, gestures, and personal appearances of attire.

Communication is necessary in social life, and is especially significant for a leader as excellent communication power strengthens relationships amongst group members, and provides the opportunity to identify with other members of a group (Son, 2006). The importance of communication between leaders and members of groups can be examined (Kim & Choi, 2005, p. 101). Firstly, communication has the presupposition of cooperation, and the means of coordination. Thus, communication makes cooperation possible; cooperative actions become the means of coordination. Secondly, communication provides and exchanges necessary information so as to help to make good decisions. Precise, rapid, appropriate, excellent communication secures the quality of decision making. Thirdly, communication is a means of

solving conflicts. Finally, communication is one way of maintaining control in an organisation, and a means of raising the morale of members.

In communication, the ability to listen and understand the message being communicated is also crucial. Prior to speaking, it is necessary to listen carefully to other's messages. Hence, training in listening is necessary in improving communication skills. Kim and Choi (2005, p. 118) believed that the following points can be useful for effective listening:

- 1) Effective use of time
- 2) The ability to think one step in front of others
- 3) The ability of summarise other people's words
- 4) The ability to discern the truth in other people's messages
- 5) The ability to read between the lines
- 6) Understand that the ability to listen is influenced by emotions
- 7) Not easily distracted from a task

Although it is important for the leader to present his/her opinion well, it is also very important to listen to the members in order to understand them for the leader to speak his or her opinion, answer and act to persuade them.

The most efficient communication is in one-to-one relationship. Efficient communication requires a skill which can be gained by through practice and education. A leader should learn the ability to use logical and emotional language in order to communicate efficiently. It is necessary for a leader to understand the feelings of others through the way he/she sees the world, i.e. sympathy. In conclusion, the development of interpersonal communication skills must include an attention to realistic and healthy self-concept, concern for others, empathy, and cooperative working skills. Communication skills are one of the most important skills in the building of healthy future role images in our gifted future leaders (Parker & Begnaud, 2004).

d. Thinking Skills

One of the major goals of higher education in Harvard University is to "think...clearly and effectively." The significance of thinking skills is illustrated in John Dewey's comment that "learning is learning to think" and in Albert Einstein's belief that "imagination is more important than knowledge" (Parker & Begnaud, 2004, pp.13-14). Creative and critical

thinking is essential in effective leadership development as it is important that gifted students should reach high-level training in thinking skills (Clark, 1997). Thus, it can be seen that teachers naturally expect gifted students to compare, analyse, discover the cause and effect, and develop abilities to make proper decisions and inferences. In the next section, methods to cultivate critical and creative thought power will be examined.

Critical Thinking Skills

Critical thinking elicits critical consciousness and serious examinations of various topics. It is analytical and reflective. This highest level of appraising function of thought is to recognise logical, independent thinking, bias, supposition, and discrepancies (Clark, 1997). Lipman (1994) believed that critical thinking leads children think more philosophically and went on to emphasised the necessity of studying philosophy. Philosophy provides students the power of judgment, which develops the ability of high-level thought. It is indispensable to teach critical thinking power as children and adolescents must learn to discover problems by themselves, examine them, and form a high level thinking.

Although gifted education has numerous programmes to improve creative and productive thinking skills, it is rare for the programmes to cultivate the critical thinking skills. Lipman (1994) also highlighted the need for teaching critical thinking in leadership gifted students. However, the critical thinking skills taught in primary schools can be criticised as they fail to distinguish between the further thinking skills and the better thinking skills. There are many ways to promote thinking through education. Gifted education has many programmes to promote creative thinking, but it does not make effort to advance critical thinking skills. There is also confusion between thinking function such as inference and learning strategy. At times, solving a problem is more emphasised than identifying a problem. Critical thinking should be the motivating power to recognise problems. Lastly, problems being solved on paper are emphasised and therefore, there is a lack of realistic practice of skills learnt. Learning how to solve problems only on paper may not help the students who have colloquial propensity. It also restrains critical and lively debating functions. In addition, without group work and practice of skills with other students, students may be isolated from each other. If groups in a class lack cooperative learning atmosphere and debate environments, critical thinking skills may not be developed.

Due to various weaknesses of the current critical thinking skills taught, Lipman (1994)

suggested a new approach for improving critical thinking skills:

New Approach to Developing Critical Thinking Skills	Details
Think within the academic learning discipline.	If education programmes are to function properly, it is believed that mathematics should be taught in a mathematical way as science is taught in a scientific way. Students who study history should not merely learn about the contents of history, but should learn how to think historically.
Think in an interdisciplinary way.	Students should learn to become flexible in finding relationships between various disciplines. Gifted education programmes should generate academic thinking and judgment to see integrated and applied knowledge from many disciplines.
Think of academic knowledge.	Students should also know of various academic disciplines and be critical as well.
Develop thinking ability.	Since gifted students who are familiar with independent or self-oriented learning are excellent in corrective thinking ability, they will achieve self-oriented advancement through intensification of corrective thinking ability.
Develop concept formation.	Education should include the development of concept formation and the understanding relationships between concepts.
Strengthen judgments.	Judgment is part of the decision making process which distinguishes between what is true and false, good and evil. Judgment also applies to a general understanding of a specific situation. It is difficult to educate those who lack judgement ability.

Table 5.4: An Approach to the Guidance of Critical Thinking Skills (Lipman, 1994).

Creative Thinking Skills

Creative thinking skills are one of the most important themes in education (Coleman & Cross, 2001). Torrance (1988) describes the creative process as a process of perceiving difficulties, problems, information, lacking elements, insecurities, and establishing hypotheses, examining, and correcting, reappraising, and delivering results. Lim (1995, p. 23) defines creativity as the trait related to “individual thinking towards newness.” Scholars agree that creative thinking

involves fluency, flexibility, uniqueness, and preciseness (Smunity, Veenker, & Veenker, 1989).

Creativity includes other many elements. The purpose of developing creative thinking skills is to make people realise their creativity, to strengthen creativity through exercises, to teach the function of creative thinking, and to persuade them to participate in creative activities (Davis & Rimm, 1994). To aid the development of creative thinking, children could be told creative stories from a young age, and may be encouraged to plan creative activities, to provide multifarious activities and materials, and to value their ideas (Smunity, Veenker, & Veenker, 1989).

Development of Thinking Skills through Socratic Questions

The method of teaching and stimulating thinking skills through questions is called the Socratic Method. The Socratic Method of debating and questioning is one of the most effective methods to develop the high level function of thinking in gifted students. It is through Socratic questioning that the teachers can clearly observe the effect of their teachings in their students (Van Tassel-Baska, 1992). According to Adler (1982, 1983), Socratic questions can create new ideas in students, awaken creative and investigative strengths which stimulate imaginations and intelligence. The Socratic method of questioning is also called 'midwifery' which emphasises the use of questions and debate about a topic. Prior to entering into the learning process of a theme, many books on the theme should be read. This method would encourage teaching a class in the way of a seminar.

The teacher or the one who asks the questions in a Socratic manner in a class should have the following attitudes towards questioning (Struck, 2003): giving people time to think and answer, give and ask open questions for students to apply and appraise information and to draw out insights from their statements and polemic points. Socratic seminars are a useful teaching and learning method for all students. This method is for teachers to help students to understand important ideas and concepts through the use of critical and creative thinking.

All in all, critical and creative thinking skills was mentioned by a number of participant teachers who believed that critical thinking should be included into a leadership gifted curriculum. Hence, these aforementioned skills can be a part of the model leadership gifted curriculum.

e. Speech Skills

Speech skills are necessary for leaders as it is important for them to communicate effectively. Speech skills can help leaders to persuade others, to negotiate and to realise or clarify their own views and thoughts. Speech skills development training allows students to learn about the general understanding of speech and its methods in order to develop their speech ability. It helps a leader to acquire strong leadership with the effective art of speech. Min (2006) revealed that compared to other countries, Koreans were weaker at presentation skills; moreover, it was found that female speech skills were much more advanced than males'. It was because female Koreans expressed roughly 80-90% and Korean males, only 60% of what they knew. Thus, it is necessary for Koreans to develop their speech skills (Min, 2006).

5.4.4. Methods to Develop Leadership Skills

Leadership skills can be developed in leaders in various ways through family relationships and school curricula at kindergarten, primary school, secondary school and university levels (Korea Development Institute, 1992, pp. 142-146).

a. Family Relationships

Karnes and Bean (1990) emphasised that the development of leadership skills in young people begins at home where the stimulating environment can lead children to gain self-esteem, broad interests, and skills and characteristics of leaders. The role of parents was seen as significant as they can provide their children with support and encouragement as they participate in a wide variety of home and community activities (Karnes & Bean, 1990). The influence of parental thought also seems significant as female leaders report that they had grown up in a family with no gender discrimination from their parents. Some famous female politicians have been produced from the homes of great politicians. For example, the female politician, India Gandhi was born, succeeding her father Gandhi. The role of parents are also significant in developing leadership skills as they serve as good models for their children in the formation of their sense of values.

b. School Education

Through the whole course of school education, students should be taught how to become democratic citizens. School education should demonstrate the principle of leadership development which is how men and women have equal opportunity. Furthermore, Korean gender stereotyping should be re-evaluated and action should be taken so that such re-evaluation can take place. For instance, textbooks should be updated to include what the role of a female leader. Teacher training should also include gender equality in education so that both male and female teachers are not biased against female leadership. There should also be a proper educational course/training for leadership gifted students in the form of leadership development programmes. Female leadership can also be developed through aiding their understanding of future career prospects as women. For instance, career teachers at schools can be taught specifically about ways to teach about careers for females.

c. Social Education

Social education is as important as school education. Leaders recognised in local societies can be invited to share in their personal experiences. Leadership training programmes can be provided through debates and practices. Such programmes or talks will be able to disclose and train the students in what it means to be a leader, what the traits of leaders are, what development strategies they have used to develop leadership skills, what roles leaders have in society, analysis of leaders' own character, and the direction of leadership development. The students can be trained in speech skills, theory of speech, humour and conversation skills. Various situations or cases can be presented to the students for the practice of leadership skills in the classroom.

Overall, leadership skills should be developed through education at home as well as schools.

5.4.5. Conclusion

Society should provide opportunities for intellectual leaders to develop their knowledge. For instance, thinking skills, attitudes and disposition towards creative production should be promoted through education in order to facilitate intellectual thought. According to Sternberg (1985), powerful ideas emanate from individuals who have developed large knowledge bases.

Most good leaders tend to be brought up, since a young age, to develop confidence and intrapersonal skills such as self-understanding under parents' love and concern through a variety of home and community activities. Gifted leaders are brought up from an early age to cultivate responsibility and decision making skills. They also learn interpersonal skills and academic knowledge through school, friendships, and teachers. By reading the biographies of outstanding leaders, students should be encouraged to analyse and evaluate their own motivations, contributions and influences on them from each leader, and assess their leadership styles employed.

Parents and teachers should also demonstrate leadership characteristics for their children or students by listening openly and thoughtfully without expecting them to accept their social, political, and economic views. Mutual respect, objectivity, empathy, and understanding are highly valued by gifted young students. Good leaders think positively and actively in every task that they do. Gifted students have greater sensitivity in social, moral and ethical awareness. We must nurture these sensitivities through appropriate curricula, understanding of real-life problems, awareness of worldwide news, and direct communication with other gifted children around the world (Passow & Schiff, 1989).

According to Renzulli, (1986) the aim of gifted education is to raise gifted children as leaders. In addition, the talent of gifted students should not be used for one's own selfish desire, but for the state and society. Thus, all four areas of leadership development, which are self, social, moral and leadership development should be researched and provided for the leadership gifted to cultivate them into leaders of society. In terms of Korean gifted education, which is still in its early stages, it should not only aim to cultivate intelligent giftedness but also their characteristics and creativity so that they can be trained to become leaders in any society.

Chapter 6: Suggestions for a Model Curriculum/Programme

In this section of the thesis, research question (h): *How is the suggested model to be implemented?* will be answered. In order to discuss the implementation of FALM in a curricular and programme format, the theory behind and literature of gifted education curricula and programmes will be described.

No.	Research Question	Summary of Answers	Main Sections to Refer to
h)	<i>How is the suggested model to be implemented?</i>	The importance of the implementation of curricula was emphasised in this section as well as highlighting the various types of gifted leadership education available currently. Finally, the Korean context was taken into account to implement the suggested model. Overall, the FALM was suggested to be implemented as a possible basis for a model curriculum, as well as being implemented as a programme or a curriculum in the Korean gifted educational context.	Chapter 6. (pp.157-188).

6.1. The Foundation of Gifted Education Curricula

According to the once U.S. Secretary of Education, Marland (1972), special educational programmes should be provided for the gifted in order to develop their giftedness. Programmes which are suitable for the level of gifted students' abilities and their motivation to learn should be supplied in order to develop their potentials. Teaching methods and learning strategies for gifted students should be differentiated from those of typical students due to the gifted students' psychological and learning traits which are different from the typical students' (Maker, 1982). Nevertheless, it is difficult to find educational curricula which are appropriate for the individual abilities, talents, learning demands and characteristics of each gifted student. When choosing or developing a gifted education curriculum or programme, Park (1999) believed that the following questions should be considered by academics and teachers:

1. Do the curricula/programmes emphasise the teaching of creative thinking, creative problem solving, and thinking skills?
2. Are these teaching methods flexible and open enough to improve gifted students' abilities in accordance with their pace of learning?
3. Do they encourage gifted students to have a positive view of themselves rather

than simply being a method that allows that to obtain good results?

4. Do they bestow learning environments which provide them with cognitive stimuli?
5. Do they exclude gifted students from their peers? (p. 2)

Park (1999) also stated that all gifted education programmes should be able to cater for the gifted students in the following ways:

1. Gifted education curricula should not be uniform but flexible and open for alterations.
2. Gifted education curricula should be developed in order to explore the specific talents gifted students possess.
3. Phased and gradual development paradigms of gifted education curricula should be considered, taking the intellectual interests and the characteristics of gifted students, as well as the realistic scholastic contexts into account.

These questions and guidelines should be taken into account in the formation and implementation of a gifted curricula/programme, in order to improve its suitability to gifted students. Therefore gifted education curricula should be formed by considering various factors such as the flexibility of the curriculum and to what extent they cater for the talents and interests of the students.

6.2. The Importance of Gifted Education Programmes

Although gifted education programmes are presented in various forms, all gifted programmes are structured in order to achieve the aims of gifted education. As there are various theories which are the bases of these gifted education programmes, it is necessary to explore what constitutes the infrastructure of gifted education programmes to fully understand gifted education programmes (Park, 2006).

The key aim of all gifted education programmes is to provide for the needs of the gifted students, which could not be satisfied within the typical classroom conditions (Clark, 2002). Gifted education programmes are important because they function as a reference for identification and evaluation of gifted students. The identification of the gifted is significant in order to delineate the students who are appropriate for gifted education programmes.

Nevertheless, although gifted education programmes are especially designed for gifted students, problems as to whether these programmes have definite traits to be differentiated from previous programmes, or whether the function of the programmes is clearly described, are discussed in many educational researches (Pfeiffer, 2001). Various gifted education programmes are also evaluated and criticised by academics and teachers according to the way in which each programme identifies the gifted students from the typical students. However, when Pfeiffer (2001) investigated methods to solve the issue of identification of gifted students through questionnaire surveys distributed to various gifted education specialists, it was found that they believed that the identification of gifted students should be conducted independently from gifted education programmes. Numerous other researches such as Rash and Miller's (2000) and Sherry et al.'s (2003) all revealed that many people believed that the identification of gifted students should be an independent process carried out from various gifted education programmes. Finally, another debated issue in the development of gifted education programmes is how many gifted programmes are integrated and currently used in schools, whose effects are not proven (Borland, 2003).

6.3. Types of Gifted Programmes

The two international streams in gifted educational programmes are accelerated gifted education and enriched gifted education. Accelerated education allows gifted students to learn next school year's education programme early, depending on their speed of learning. Enrichment education helps gifted students to deal with the topics in the education programme in depth. Most of gifted education programmes are mixed with both enrichment education and acceleration education (Clark, 2002). Suh et al. (2003) also believed that the best gifted programme utilises both accelerated and enriched education. According to VanTassel-Baska (2000) gifted education is composed of acceleration and enrichment, which has become the main context of gifted curricula since Terman (1925).

The early U. S. gifted education, which provided special programmes for the gifted since the second half of the nineteenth century, was acceleration oriented. The one who lead acceleration oriented programmes was Professor Julian Stanley of John Hopkins University. He formed the acceleration programme of mathematics gifted project, SMPY (Study of Mathematically Precocious Youth). VanTassel-Baska and Brown (2004) understood the SMPY as the typical model of acceleration, and the ET/RDM (Enrichment Triad/Revolving

Door Model) as the typical model of enrichment. The SMPY and ET/RDM are two influential gifted programme curricula since the 1970s. The SMPY programme attempted to identify gifted students through a gifted mathematics project. The top 3 percent of students in subjects such as mathematics, languages or all subjects were recognised as gifted. The SMPY developed into the Gifted Centre of Johns Hopkins University and became the epicentre of acceleration education.

On the other hand, Renzulli is the leading scholar of ET/RDM, enrichment learning centred model education (Jun, 2000). The ET/RDM model, which has been suggested by Renzulli (1986), has been embodied by research classes, science project competitions and so on.

Although it is recognised that acceleration and enrichment are standard references in gifted programmes, what is influential in defining giftedness is the development of intelligence theory (Clark, 2002). Since the recent development of intelligence theory, many forms of gifted programmes have been suggested. The representative gifted programmes of intelligence theory are the multiplex intelligence theory and its gifted programme (Rue, 2004).

Two gifted education programmes related to intelligence theory are the practical intelligence programme and the multiple intelligence programme. Between these two programmes, the representative one is the gifted education programme utilising multiplex intelligence theory (Rue, 2004). In the light of the constitution of gifted education programme, enrichment stresses difficulty and easiness while acceleration highlights the order of education curriculum input method. In comparison with acceleration and enrichment, intelligence theory programme is composed of education curriculum characterised by intelligence. Gifted education programmes of enrichment and acceleration make use of both enrichment and acceleration. On the contrary, gifted education programme utilising intelligence theory has an approach different from enrichment and acceleration. Intelligence programme is the gifted education programme founded on independent theories of intelligence by Gardner, Sternberg, etc, rather than on gifted education programmes thus far used. Intelligence programme suggests various methods to teach success intelligence and to elevate students' practical intelligence (Sternberg & Grigorenko, 2004).

Numerous other methods have also been suggested in order to teach and promote intelligence for success and practice (Sternberg & Grigorenko 2004). Sternberg and Grigorenko (2004) suggested diverse methods to teach "successful intelligence" and to enhance "practical

intelligence.” Gardner (1983) and Sternberg (1985) respectively developed gifted programmes related to intelligence theory on the basis of their own intelligence theory. In order to help understand gifted programmes, a table of detailed comparison amongst programmes is suggested below (See Table 6.1):

	Acceleration type	Enrichment type	Intelligence type
Features	To learn the contents of the next academic year earlier than peers	To learn the contents of the present school level intensely	To learn through programmes to maximise intelligence
Main Programmes	SMPY	ET/RDM	Discover Programme
Aims of the Models	Early accomplishment of ability	Advancement of the level of ability	Maximisation of a specific intelligence

Table 6.1: Comparisons of Gifted Programmes of Acceleration, Enrichment, and Intelligence Theories (Park, 2006, p. 29).

The debate about whether students should be taught through an enrichment or acceleration model has been ongoing from the beginning of gifted education. Various programmes adopted by Korean gifted institutions are acceleration-oriented, but many people argue that they should be enrichment-centred (Han, 2006). On the other hand, it can be seen that learning through both acceleration and enrichment develops the high potentials of gifted students, satisfies their individual learning desires, expands the depth of knowledge, and develops creativity and various thinking skills.

However, learning through both acceleration and enrichment can make it hard to distinguish one form of learning from the other. Consequently, this may be a reason why many teachers of gifted students are experiencing confusion in guiding gifted students (Jin, 2005). Nevertheless, the two models can also be seen as complementing each other, than to unanimously distinguish either the acceleration or enrichment model in developing gifted programmes. Passow (1985) maintains that programmes should be developed in balance of the two.

Davis and Rimm (1985) regard acceleration as a programme used to place gifted students in an advanced class and to earn credits, and see enrichment as a programme aimed to supplement or

enrich the learning in the classroom. Acceleration can be made possible if the learning curricula of secondary schools that the gifted students attend can be designed for earlier graduation of secondary school or earlier entrance of university. Earlier entrance, grade skipping, and compact programmes (telescoping) are considered as acceleration (Davis & Rimm, 1985).

Although there are various learning programmes related to gifted education thus far studied, gifted programmes of enrichment and acceleration will be dealt with in the following section in more detail.

6.3.1. Accelerated Gifted Programmes

Acceleration is a strategy to promote gifted students to the advanced school year regardless of their age level. Acceleration is used as a way to shorten the learning period of able students (Brody & Benbow 1987). Rogers (1990) maintains that acceleration is a programme which allows gifted students to learn the curricula of a specific time or age earlier than they would normally do. Acceleration learning provides opportunities for the gifted to choose challenging and interesting programmes for themselves. It is an appropriate strategy to apply for systematic subjects such as mathematics. Accelerated learning, which shortens learning time in accordance with gifted students' latent potential levels, provides them opportunities of grade skipping, subject skipping, telescoping, earlier university entrance, and earlier graduation.

Allowing earlier entrance in kindergartens or schools is an acceleration strategy that accommodates gifted children's ardour, high energy, curiosity, imagination, and learning desire (Feldhusen, 1992). Several researchers (Feldhusen 1992; Proctor, Feldhusen & Black 1988) agree that acceleration is the most cost-effective and easiest teaching method for gifted students. However, George (1992) suggests that compacting or telescoping is more preferable than grading skipping within the classroom as compacting the curriculum within the classroom allows the students to do their work at their own speed preventing the students from boredom due to repetitive tasks whilst being around students in their own age group. Furthermore, problems of acceleration or grade skipping, especially in primary schools are described by school teachers, headmasters, and psychologists (Cornell et al., 1991; Southern, Jones, & Fiscus, 1989):

- Accelerated students might find it difficult to form friendships with older students

which may lead to unhappy school lives. They might lose opportunities to develop social relationships with others.

- Accelerated students might not have enough time to participate in extra-curricular activities after school activities due to their workload.
- Acceleration might give rise to excess study demands and stress. Thus, it could lead the students to mental and physical burnouts, rebellion, and emotional insecurity.
- Many accelerated students who skip grades tend not to develop leadership skills.
- Some accelerated students develop an arrogant and conceited attitude towards other students and teachers.

Amongst the above considerations, many educators and researchers are most concerned for the social and emotional wellbeing of the students (Bonshek & Walters, 1998; Eyre, 1997; Freeman, 1991; George, 1992, 1995; Hymer, 2003; Montgomery, 2001). Freeman (1991, 1998) voices her concern of acceleration for those who are not emotionally stable as acceleration would disrupt such children's social development. Hymer (2003) also mentions that acceleration would produce emotional and social problems to the students. Therefore, the educators must be aware of:

[The] child's sense of personal involvement in their schooling; changes in friendship groups; need for peer acceptance; time to play around; opportunities to develop crucial trans-intellective capacities such as resilience, reflectiveness resourcefulness, empathy and the quality of relationship with staff (Hymer 2003, p. 34).

However, despite these problems, earlier entrance and acceleration strategy have been proved to be effective in many researches (Feldhusen 1992; Proctor, Feldhusen & Black 1988). Gold (1979) emphasised the positive outcomes of acceleration learning in the gifted. In the United Kingdom, acceleration is widely used and is generally positively regarded (Pocklington, Fletcher-Campbell, & Kendall, 2002). They also point out that acceleration improves students' confidence and self-esteem. Other positive reasons of acceleration can be summarised as follows (VanTassel-Baska, 1986, pp. 179-196) Accelerated gifted students experience an improvement in their motivation, self-confidence, and learning style.

- Acceleration does not allow the students to become intellectually lazy.
- It helps the gifted students to finish formal education earlier than the norm. Brody and

Stanley (1991) believed that the most appropriate time for grade skipping is 5 to 6 years before middle school or 8 to 9 years prior to high school.

- It reduces the costs for university education as they are able to graduate earlier than normal.
- Accelerated gifted students experience an improvement in their motivation, self-confidence, and learning style.

Intellectually gifted students usually find it difficult to feel challenged in regular school classrooms and can easily become bored and frustrated resulting in less learning. Many regard that such gifted students' learning motivation, self-concept, and study habits are positively improved due to grade skipping (Benbow 1992; Feldhusen 1992; VanTassel-Baska 1986). Thomson (2006, p. 95) emphasised the benefits of acceleration as flexible implementation of various forms of acceleration aids gifted pupils to cover a range of subjects in greater depth and are able to enrich their curriculum by:

- Taking an advanced level of study through attending lectures or online learning;
- Undertaking a thematic study;
- Choosing to take an extra subject (which can be one which is not normally offered in the school);
- Taking the opportunity to a school exchange programme abroad to provide a gap year experience instead of early university transference.

In conclusion, acceleration is a controversial issue in gifted education. In the past, acceleration was more popular in the United States than in the United Kingdom due to different teaching approaches (White et al., 2003). Recently, acceleration is more recognised in the United Kingdom in the fields of mathematics, modern foreign languages (Montgomery, 1996; Sinmur, 1991), music, ballet, or sports (Montgomery, 2001) and many schools have now accepted grade skipping so that academically advanced students can enter university at the age of 16 ("The U.K. Cannot Be Second Best", 2007).

However, the acceleration system is more focused on the students' abilities and achievements rather than about their interests and concerns. It can also be applied only to a small number of gifted students. Those students who are beyond the teaching schedule and provisions of the school are likely to be exposed to possible developmental difficulties in terms of their intelligence, body, society, and emotion. For instance, while the intelligence level of gifted

students may be similar to the level of students with whom they are studying, the developmental levels of other areas in the gifted students are likely to be different from the other students.' It can also be seen that the gifted students could have a negative influence in the emotional and social development of other students (Coleman, 1985).

In this sense, subject skipping, in which gifted students who excel in some subjects can be allowed to attend the subject hour of a more advanced class or year instead of grade skipping could be a better practical option. Therefore, prior to grade skipping or earlier entrance, it is recommended for gifted students to be examined by psychologists or education psychologists to assess their social growth and aptitude to test whether they can adapt to the new environment. However, some parents or schools may prefer to visible effects of acceleration (Jun, 2000).

6.3.2. Enrichment Learning Programmes

The school enrichment programme is a technical education not only for the gifted minority but also for regular education curricula. It is an education programme which can be chosen according to the individual learner's interest, concerns, or level. It can be altered to suit the needs and the aims of the student. Teachers can use it as a part of special activities, or select some part of it and use it as an extended content of ordinary education curriculum, so that it is necessary to develop an enriched learning programme with high flexible management. Freeman (1991) said that enrichment should be available to all. Nevertheless,

... for the gifted, it [or enrichment learning] is a particularly important aspect of their developing mental life. Enrichment is the vital stuff of a truly enhancing education for those who have the capacity to grasp the gist of the subject they are learning, relate it to other areas, and play with ideas in the processes of creativity (Freeman, 1991, p. 215).

Such learning however requires more attention from teachers as able children will be allowed to work intensively at their own pace which may require the teachers to supervise more closely (Freeman, 1991).

a. Definition of Educational Enrichment

Educational enrichment is defined as the delving into the basic curriculum subject in more depth to become aware of the contextual background of the subject area (Freeman, 1998).

Enrichment learning is a way to intensify an education curriculum and to provide opportunities to see the practical aspect of it. It is an educational curriculum which is corrected and complemented for ample and various educational experiences (Howley, Howley, & Pendarvis, 1986; Schiever & Maker 2003). This and other approaches to enrichment are widely applicable across ages and subjects and so variable in curricular content that they still require validation research (Tannenbaum, 1983)

Enrichment learning especially helps kindergarten or primary school pupils to have contact with educational environments which provide them with many educational experiences. For instance, it helps the pupils to have various experiences by letting them visit museums, fire stations, and post offices. Pupils are therefore able to widen their understanding of life through such experiences and opportunities. Enrichment learning is a teaching and learning method which promotes creative thinking and develops special talents and latent abilities through gifted programme participation, field learning, carrying out individual projects, and receiving specialist teaching after school, on weekends, and during vacations (Jin, 2005).

Enrichment is most frequently used for gifted students (Huh, 2005). Even though the topic of enrichment is dealt with in most gifted education literature, it is only cautiously approved as many are surprised at its ubiquity and advocacy. According to Clark (1988) enrichment should be well-planned, and enhanced by other modifications, or it will not help gifted students. Otherwise, enriched education could instigate boredom for the partaking students. Frost (1981) maintains that enrichment includes learning activities to satisfy various desires and abilities of students since it complements the depth and the broadness of learning contents which are offered to ordinary students, and provides various educational experiences. George (1995) also maintains that enrichment should be well designed and planned and the following characteristics should be taken into consideration when designing an enriched curriculum:

- Content beyond the national curriculum
- Exposure to a variety of subjects
- Student-selecting content

- High content complexity
- Maximum achievement in basic skills
- Creative thinking and problem solving
- Motivation (George, 1995, p. 51)

b. Enriched Gifted Programmes

To have enrichment is to include various programme components into existing programmes (Shore, Cornell, Robinson, & Ward, 1991). For instance, schools may offer enrichment activities as a part of the timetable (Renzulli, 2003). However, enrichment is more than just providing pupils with materials. It should incorporate flexible and sensitive interactions between pupils and teachers who understand needs of the pupils. Through effective enrichment, pupils will be given the opportunity to broaden of their horizons and experiences whereas broadening of knowledge would only aid them to move on to higher order concepts or skills (George, 1992). The following section will examine various available enrichment programmes. Feldhusen (1998) introduced several enrichment programmes which have recently been developed in the United States: the enrichment triad/revolving door model advanced by Renzulli and Reis (1986), the individualised programme planning model (IPPM) of Teffinger (1986), and the Purdue three-stage model advocated by Feldhusen and Kollof (1979, 1986).

1. Enrichment Triad Model

The Enrichment Triad or the Revolving Door Model has been famously developed by Renzulli and Reis (1986) and has been acclaimed by many scholars in the field. It is commonly accepted that Renzulli's Enrichment Triad Model is one of the best-known approaches to broaden students' interests. This programme emphasises its adaptability in many schools and year groups. This type of learning, in principle, provides learning environments where the students are at liberty to choose to learn and have individual teaching which is necessary for gifted students (Renzulli, 1977). The programme also encourages all learning activities to be admired and supported.

The Enrichment Triad is composed of three stage models to help students to enrich their learning. Renzulli (1977) suggests that all partaking students should go through the three stages of enrichment in order to achieve effective learning.

Type I Enrichment (General Exploratory Activities)

The first stage of enrichment is to provide general exploratory activities related to a subject area. This stage aims to elicit interests and motivation from the students by dealing with various problems and disputed issues, rather than to teach technical and detailed areas of the subject. It encourages the students to experience the knowledge learnt by letting students come into contact with various topics and fields which are not typically dealt with. In this way, students can have enriched learning by focusing on the activities. These activities would lead students to discover their fields of interests. Enrichment activities may be aided by various learning materials such as books and journals, as well as doing activities such as going on visits to listen to invited lectures.

Type II Enrichment (Group Training Activities)

In the second stage of enrichment learning is to provide some group training activities for the gifted students in the areas of thinking skills and exploratory skills in various areas of interest so that their talents can be exhibited. At this stage, students can be aided to conduct small group learning activities. This stage is the stage in which strategic enrichment learning which stresses methodological learning is achieved.

Type III Enrichment (Individual and Small Group Investigations of Real Problems)

In the third stage of enrichment learning, individuals or small groups develop problem solving skills. At this stage, technical research about real problems produces intelligent outputs of problems related to life. This can be done through carrying out projects in the students' interest areas which were identified in the first two stages. In Stages One and Two, students are able to study their own interest areas. In Renzulli's Type Three enrichment, students are encouraged to develop their interest and produce a project in a creative way. Such enrichment is used in 70-80% of mainstream American elementary, middle and high schools as a form of gifted education (Davis & Rimm, 1985).

In this way, Stages One and Two of the Enrichment Triad Model help to achieve the final stage. As this model includes not only gifted students but also typical students in order to provide gifted education to a wider population, it is evaluated to benefit more students. An advantage

of this model is that as every student is the receiver of the gifted education, it promotes students' motivations and aids students to have a more positive attitude towards school (Jin, 2005).

2. School-Wide Enrichment Model (SEM)

The School-Wide Enrichment Model is also based on the previously mentioned Three-Stage Enrichment Learning Model but makes some improvements (Renzulli, Reis, & Smith, 1981). Park (1999) believed that this model immensely contributes towards the renovation of gifted education.

There are two main traits of this enrichment model. Firstly, there is the talent pool approach in the identification of gifted students. After choosing the top five percent of students, the chosen students carry out the activities of acceleration and enrichment whilst the teachers observe the giftedness of the chosen gifted students. Gifted learning activities are run by a pullout scheme. (Pull-out gifted schemes run during weekends, after school and holidays. Alternatively, the students can go to a gifted institution for whole days for intensive training) However, in order to prevent the students who are not chosen and their parents from complaining that this model promotes elite education and an unjust system, the model chooses the top 15~20% of ordinary students as gifted students. Also, if some students who are not chosen wish to receive gifted education, they can participate in it and carry out individual research projects for the teachers to supervise and observe for a period of one year. In this way, possible problems which may arise due to eager students and parents are prevented.

Secondly, in the SEM, gifted education is extended to the whole school. The SEM integrates both stages one and two of Renzulli's enrichment model. The SEM provides programmes to the gifted students by altering the degree of difficulty of tasks, the sizes of a group and by forming learning groups according to the interests of each gifted student. The third stage encourages students to participate in and to develop a permanent project of their interests after a brief orientation. Thus, all talent pool students are to go through enrichment stages one and two and to join ordinary enrichment learning for the whole school as well. Teachers are asked to recommend students who will participate in the final enrichment learning stage. The teachers then encourage the research projects chosen by the gifted students, and the gifted conduct their research projects with gifted teachers. 50~60% of gifted students annually complete more than one project of in the third stage of the enrichment programme. On the

other hand, ordinary teachers accelerate learning activities for latent gifted students, and provide a more challengeable curriculum to them. If by utilising curriculum compacting, teachers guide the gifted effectively, they are expected to achieve successful learning.

According to Reis et al.'s (1992) research, if the gifted students follow the gifted curriculum which compacts 40-50% of ordinary curriculum, gifted students tend not to fall below their level of expectation, and their attitudes towards the school were seen to improve.

3. Purdue Three-Stage Enrichment Model (1979, 1986)

This model was developed as an enrichment programme in 1973 for university students, but gradually became a gifted programme (Feldhusen & Kolloff, 1986). Feldhusen of Perdue University developed with Kolloff a systematised model at the primary level which helps to achieve the aims of gifted students and can be used as a pullout programme. This model is called PACE (Programme for Academy and Creative Enrichment), and is easily applied to the gifted class from age 8 to 15. This model focuses on creativity growth and aims to promote various thinking functions, problem solving, research functions, and independent learning. The Purdue programme is a three-stage enrichment learning model which aims to develop various functions (Feldhusen & Kolloff, 1986).

Stage One aims to develop the basic convergent and divergent thinking skills. It focuses on workbook activities and the development of thinking functions, especially in language, and also promotes creative thinking. This undertaking will cultivate flexibility, fluency, and originality in thinking skills. This stage takes 2~3 weeks and allows students to meet at least two whole days a week. At this stage, it is important that the thinking skills be taught to the gifted students at an appropriate speed and level. Stage Two teaches diverse and practical skills, as a stage to develop creative problem solving skills, library use skills, and brainstorming. It also helps students to cultivate exploratory skills and to conduct project-oriented activities according to the students' individual interest areas. Stage Three focuses on acquiring skills related to individual researches. This stage consists of developing their independent research skills as they build up a project which is more developed than the assigned research project, and in the process cultivate creativity and productivity.

The Purdue Three-Stage Model which is also a pullout method, have students to conduct the first stage for the first several weeks, and carry out the second stage for next 12 to 16 weeks.

In the final stage, the students are encouraged to do independent researches or projects. Currently, Purdue University offers 50 subjects geared for gifted students, including writing, music, criminal investigation science, aviation physics, and insect physics. Through such gifted education, the students are helped to find their talents and their interest areas (Choi, 2007). The advantage of the Purdue Enrichment Model is that an educational curriculum can easily be adapted to the model and the educational curricula can comply with the student's growth. However, its disadvantage is that it requires skilled teachers which is difficult to be applied in a small school (Park, 2006).

6.3.3. Gifted Programme Based on Intelligence Theories

A gifted programme based on an intelligence theory was developed in accordance with the traits of students' intelligence. Gifted programmes based on an intelligence theory focus on practical intelligence, multiple intelligences (Gardner, 1983) SOI (Structure of Intelligence) model, TU (Talent Unlimited) and so on. DISCOVER Programme (Discovering Intellectual Strengths and capabilities while providing Opportunities for Varied Response), which is a representative of multiplex intelligence, is reported to be an appropriate gifted programme for minorities or bullied students (Reid & Romanoff, 1997). However, there are no programmes based on an intelligence theory in South Korea (Park, 2006).

Practical intelligence programme maintained by Sternberg & Grigorenko (2004) is a programme to improve students' success intelligence as this programme presupposes that gifted children are high in success intelligence. Success intelligence which Sternberg conceptualised observes adaptation ability as an important factor independently of the previous intelligence theory. Success intelligence is composed of three factors, analysis, creativity, and practice. Practical intelligence is important in gifted education since it emphasises practical ability and adaptation ability as well (Yalon-Charmovitz & Greenspan, 2005). To improve primary students' practical intelligence, Y. L. Moon (2003) suggests time management training, effective communication skills with others, and self-examination training through writing diaries.

Multiplex intelligence programme, which classifies 8 intelligence concepts, regards intelligence as creating valuable productions or as ability to solve problems. Since multiplex intelligence observes human abilities in many levels, it provides various meaning to education. There have been many attempts to apply multiplex intelligence in education. The exemplary example which utilises multiplex theory is the DISCOVER programme developed by Maker et al. (1994).

This programme whose level is that of primary school educates three intelligence areas of space, logics-mathematics, and language.

However, gifted programmes based on an intelligence theory have their limitations. The method of identification giftedness using multiplex intelligence theory is problematic in its precision (Daniel, 2001). Moreover, as the theory of multiplex intelligence is simple and easy to understand, it can be misinterpreted or misused easily when adapting and interpreting it in certain situations. Thus, much attention needs to be given when developing a programme based on an intelligence theory (Delisle, 1996).

Overall, various types of gifted education have been examined in this section, including acceleration, enrichment and intelligence theory based programmes, which are the foundational bases of all gifted education programmes. In the next section, the present state of the gifted programmes available in Korea will be discussed, followed by a proposed a model curriculum and programme, appropriate for the Korean context, which is based on the theories delineated above.

6.4. Korean Gifted Education Programmes

6.4.1. Current Gifted Programmes in Korea

Internationally, gifted education is diverse in terms of methods, contents, and levels. Gifted students with high abilities can be selected to participate in various gifted programmes in most countries. In terms of Korean gifted education, schools are currently only focusing on the identification of gifted students in mathematics and sciences. Hence, Korean educational specialists point out that the national or the local government should have interest in developments in gifted education and invest in gifted subject areas other than the sciences or mathematics (Choi, 2003).

However, such selective development of gifted education in Korea may be due to the fact that the aim of gifted education in Korea is not to promote the students' self-fulfilment but is used as a means to promote academic achievement for university entrance examinations. Many Korean parents encourage their children to enter institutes of gifted education as they believe it to be an opportunity to aid them in entering prestigious universities. Thus, many Korean students are pressed to study for mathematics and the sciences to gain places into the Korean

gifted institutes which primarily caters for gifted students in the two areas. The problem is that parents are intensely preparing their children to help them get into the institutes of gifted education by pushing their children in extra-curricular works prior to entering the institutes (Choi, 2007).

In other countries where gifted education is developed, gifted students' morality, leadership, presentation, and time management skills are cultivated besides following a curriculum (Wu, 2004). Israelite gifted education conducts an integrated education through activities under the principle of holistic education (Cho, 1995). Likewise, gifted teachers' training courses for gifted education should be increased in Korea in order for the teachers to have a fuller understanding of the aims of gifted education so that they in turn will be able to educate the students and their parents on the true meaning of gifted education.

Thus far, Korean education has been exceedingly knowledge-oriented and is based on rote-learning due to the pressures of preparing for university entrance examinations. Therefore, there is a need to introduce into Korean gifted education abilities such as creativity, problem solving, and social skills (Clark, 1989).

a. Differences in Systems

In the case of the U.S., most elementary schools have gifted classes (Choi, 2007) where gifted classes are incorporated into the mainstream curriculum. For instance, if a year group has five subjects, one of them may be a gifted class, which teaches the students at a level which is more advanced than the level of other peer classes. However, in Korean culture, parents have quite negative attitudes towards separating students to be put in higher and lower level classes (Choi, 2007), whereas in the U.S., there is no dispute about such organisation of ability based classes. Hence, Korean gifted classes are not integrated into the mainstream curriculum but are conducted for three hours after school or during weekends in the Gifted Institute of Education Offices.

There are many differences in terms of methods and contents of gifted education. Countries advanced in gifted education tend to conduct gifted classes oriented towards projects where students prepare for the projects by reading sources and presenting them. Although project-oriented studies take time, it facilitates self-study. Korean gifted students lack the skills to solve problems creatively due to the Korean culture which aims to achieve results in a short

time (Choi, 2007).

In the U.S., students who make achievements in certain subjects higher than his year group are allowed to attend the higher year classes. There are many secondary school students who take some subjects in universities and gain credits. This system is called Advance Placement scheme (AP); when certain students excel in a subject, acceleration or grade skipping is possible for them. A few gifted students can be specially managed to be given assignments which are higher than the level of the same class.

However, countries advanced in gifted education are developing gifted education programmes as they become more aware of the other gifted minorities such as the hidden gifted students or the able underachievers in schools. In contrast, Korean schools are more concerned about students with special needs rather than those with exceptional abilities. Thus, whereas other countries with advanced gifted education systems focus on the potential abilities of students as well as those who are already identified as gifted, Korean schools only concentrate on providing for those who are already acknowledged as gifted. This is because gifted education is recognised as an elite education and because governmental financial support is not easily obtainable.

The aim of the Korean government is for gifted education to be offered to the top 5% of students by 2010. Gifted education should be applicable not only to the few higher level gifted students, but there should be more support so that its programmes are developed to help children's latent talents (Han, 2006).

6.4.2. Current Situation in Gifted Education Programmes and Tasks for the Future

Despite the short history of Korean gifted education, concerns for gifted education are notable since 2002 when the enforcement ordinance for gifted education promotion law came into effect. As interests in gifted education rise, the requests for gifted programme development are increasing. In response to the demand, the Korean gifted programmes are recently developing. However, most Korean gifted programmes which claim to be enrichment-oriented are in reality, acceleration-oriented. Furthermore, the programmes are mainly problem solving programmes which are of such a high level that it discourages students to be motivated, causing disinterest and demoting creativity in students (Han, 2006).

There are various problems with the gifted education schemes in Korea. The problems of the Centres for the Gifted are as follows (Han, 2006, pp. 111-112):

1. Knowledge-based Programme Contents: Despite the gifted students being identified in terms of their various talents and abilities, the programmes that they are provided do not cater for their specific abilities but are more knowledge-based for the convenience of the teachers.
2. Programme contents which are different from educational aims: gifted education aims to develop creativity and thinking power, but the contents of the programmes do not fulfil these aims.
3. Contents of most gifted programmes are acceleration-oriented: Gifted education curricula tend to consist of knowledge and understanding; opportunities for application, analysis, synthesis, and evaluation are quite limited.
4. There is no consistency of the whole course due to continual changes of teachers. The whole course considers the convenience of lecturers or teachers rather than developing the giftedness of students.
5. Contents and features of the programme are vague.
6. Because students' interests or opinions are not reflected in the programme, the programme is short of motivating them.
7. Diverse group activities or opportunities of cooperation amongst students are scarce.
8. Suggestions or choices in selecting individual tasks are limited.
9. There is a lack of academic considerations.
10. The subjects and themes of what is taught in the programmes have no supporting educational evidence as to why they should be taught due to the lack of research in the area.
11. The taught materials do not have direct relationship to practical life.
12. Students are not given enough opportunities to present and evaluate their own research work to others.
13. They use the uniform evaluation method.
14. Studies about the effectiveness of the programmes are insufficient.
15. They are not the means to learn the qualities that scientists should have but rather mere continuation of school learning (in case of the Institute of Scientific Gifted Education).

Studies about Korean education curricula have raised similar problems as the ones mentioned above. Kim (2001) and Lee (2002) also points out the shortcomings of Korean gifted

education, which is summarised as follows:

1. Although many students want to receive practical gifted education, 70% of science gifted education is through didactic teaching.
2. Many gifted students want to understand natural phenomena in relation to physics and chemistry, or prefer to have principle-centred learning, but such desires cannot be fully met teaching oriented learning.
3. Frequent changes in teachers produce inconsistent education.
4. Students rarely have time to participate in discussions.
5. The gap in level amongst students causes huge difficulties in running the programme.

The recurring criticism in the research of Korean gifted education programmes is that they are oriented towards the availability and the convenience of the teachers rather than towards the development of the gifted students. In other words, due to the frequent changes in teachers, the gifted programme is often taught incoherently. In addition, the materials taught in the programmes are theoretical and are not related to practical life, possibly due to the fact that there is not enough time provided for the students to apply the learnt knowledge in the classroom. Overall, it is necessary for any curriculum or programme to be adjusted so it is in tune with the students' abilities and needs.

6.5. A Suggested Leadership Model Curriculum

A model is a conceptual frame, structure, or system to describe a certain phenomenon and can even be called a theory (Miller, 1989). However, a theory tends to explain the process of complicated phenomena, while a model simplifies and describes the process so that it can be understood easily (Hergenhahn, 1982). In addition, a model has a hypothesis, aim, concept, principle, and research problem like a theory (Anderson, 1995). Also, a teaching or educational model can also be called 'design of strategy' to help students' learning (Joyce, Weil, & Showers, 1992).

In this thesis, a leadership education model has been proposed on curricular and programme levels (Refer to Figure 6.1).




Figure 6.1: The Implementation of the FALM in Curricular and Programme Levels: Three Main Suggestions Made for a Model Leadership Gifted Curricula and Programme.

As it has been stated throughout this thesis, the aim of this research is to make suggestions for a model leadership gifted curriculum and programme. The FALM, which is the main suggested proposal of this thesis, can be implemented on both the curricular and programme levels of leadership gifted education. Thus, the FALM is a conceptual suggestion for a model leadership gifted curriculum, whereas the second and the third suggestions for curricular and programme implementation are suggestions for implementation and practice in the classroom.

Practical implementation of the FALM has been considered in this thesis, with special reference to their suitability within the three relevant types of educational settings available in Korea. On a curricular level, FALM can form the foundation for a curriculum as the four areas of leadership gifted development can be incorporated into the contents of a curriculum (Refer to Chapter 4). On a programme level, Renzulli's (1976, 1986) Enrichment Triad Model is recommended for the implementation of FALM in mainstream and gifted schools due to its open participation to its programme, especially in the Korean cultural context where the identification processes of the gifted is discouraged due to its equalitarian ethos (Refer to Chapter 7 for other reasons for selecting this model). The FALM-based curriculum can also

be used within the suggested Renzulli's (1986) model.

6.5.1. Four Areas Leadership (FALM) Model based on Parker's (1983) Leadership Training Model.

The FALM, based on Parker's LTM, was introduced in Chapter 4. The FALM can be both used as a school enrichment programme for the leadership gifted and as the foundation for planning a curriculum for use in the classroom. An example of how the FALM can be applied on a curricular level (Refer to Appendix VIII) is illustrated in this section for a clear understanding of how FALM can be implemented:

Title: What is Leadership?

Activity Purposes:

1. To provide opportunities to understand the concept of true leadership.
2. To identify good leadership characteristics.
3. To recognise leadership qualities in oneself and be taught that they can be leaders in various fields.
4. To develop leadership abilities such as communication skills.

Before the activities begin, the students should be encouraged to:

- 1) Explain the definition and concept of leadership.
- 2) Identify the types and characteristics of leadership to compare them with one's own.
- 3) Debate about the effective leader qualities and present them (Kim & Choi, p. 65)

Through this activity, the students should be able to grasp the overall concept of leadership and be able to examine leadership qualities within themselves.

‘What is Leadership?’ Example FALM Activities

<p style="text-align: center;">Self-development</p> <p>1) Write down good points about yourself as a leader.</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Social Development</p> <p>1) Have a discussion on the meaning of ‘good’ leadership in a society. 2) Present your own ideas of what ‘good’ leadership is.</p>
<p style="text-align: center;">Leadership Development</p> <p>1) Think about the definition and the concept of leadership. 2) Listen to a talk from a ‘leader’ in society and discuss about the characteristics of leadership.</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Moral Development</p> <p>1) Analyse the good and bad leadership and what makes leadership good or bad. 2) Make a list of who good and bad leaders of history and present day.</p>

Table 6.2: Exemplar FALM Activities (Adapted from Parker & Begnaud, 1984).

As it is shown, in this activity, the FALM can be implemented within a classroom school lesson by selection of a topic and applying the topic within the framework.

6.5.2. Leadership Model Based upon Renzulli’s Enrichment Triad Model (1976, 1986)

In this section, the FALM is implemented on a wider programme level. The programme model has been chosen as Renzulli’s Enrichment Triad Model (1986). The proposed leadership model aims to develop the programme to promote the leadership of future leaders. This programme is mainly centred on effective learning experiences through education for leadership growth, and consults the basic principles of gifted education course. The model is composed of three steps, understanding, research, and doing projects. This programme is made for students so that they can choose their learning level, so that it is possible for them to use it in accordance with their interests and abilities. Additionally, it is not simply an enrichment of compacting the contents of existing education courses, but a qualitatively differentiated programme in terms of educational goals, content and method, so that it will help to improve leadership skills in the leadership gifted students.

This model was chosen due to its stages of identifying the leadership gifted students. This is because Korean parents all have the belief that their child is gifted and when their child was not

identified as gifted, many criticised the gifted education system. This resentment was further fuelled by the belief that gifted education provides an opportunity to enter good universities as they teach advanced level subjects. In this sense, all typical students in Korea want to have an opportunity to enter gifted education. Therefore, Renzulli's (1986) model was selected as the first two of the three stages include all students who wish to participate, thus, allowing those who may not be gifted but have an interest, to participate in the programme (Huh, 2005).

a. Programme Participants

The enrichment programme for leadership growth in future leaders, introduced in this thesis, is designed for students in Years Four to Six in primary schools. This programme is for the students who are interested in leadership and have leadership traits, but because this programme is composed of various levels, it can be applicable not only to the learners suggested above but also to primary and secondary students of varied levels. In other words, in Type I and II, all students are given the chance to participate in the programme whether they are gifted or not. However, in Type III, those students who are interested in leadership skills and also possess the following leadership traits (as illustrated in Table6:3) are selected for the programme.

Although all students participate in stages 1 and 2, in the third stage, the top 15~20% of the students in typical classes form the 'gifted class' group. The gifted students who show creativity and interests in the carrying out of tasks of part three, or are evaluated to have leadership talents, are to explore to learn advanced contents concerning their chosen areas. In this way, enrichment learning can improve students' motivation to learn, and change their attitudes towards school to a positive direction (Olenchak & Renzulli, 1989).




Figure 6.2: The Target Population for a Leadership Development Enrichment Programme.

Renzulli (1995) designed this programme to provide the best opportunities to improve self-actualisation and creative productivity of the gifted by providing enrichment learning and teaching according to their abilities, interests, and needs. The methods of this programme, explained in more detail below, are introduced in three enrichment learning types: I, II, III. This model starts with students' general exploratory activities. Students then advance to learning the skills, and then they conduct investigations of real problems and eventually produce performances for real audiences. This model includes the use of many human resources so that

it gives opportunities to students who are not distinctly identified as gifted to participate in the programme.

Type I: Enrichment- General Exploratory Experiences

This programme's goal is for the students to experience a variety of learning areas. It aims to stimulate experiences and interests in the students, which are not dealt with in regular activities, such as visual and performance, hobbies, and debates. This enrichment learning is centred on events such as invited lectures, speaker's visits, video showings, and visits to local learning institutes. It provides opportunities of field learning to meet with politicians, educators, historians and curators so that students can develop interests in leaders' or specialists' activities. The activities involved in the first stage helps students to choose enrichment activities in the second stage. The third stage aims for individual students or small groups to become interested in and pursue enrichment activities.

Renzulli (1977) defines enrichment experience as below:

- More than regular education course.
- Considers gifted students' interests in specific contents.
- Considers learning patterns to which gifted students prefer.
- Provides opportunities in order not to limit the level that students explore specific topic area.

Prior to entering enrichment learning of Types Three, teachers are supposed to identify individual traits in terms of students' levels of abilities, concerns, learning styles. They should collect basic resources necessary to provide each gifted student appropriate education experiences. It is not by shortening the time to study or to teach regular education courses, but by evaluating what they study to secure time necessary to do enrichment learning. Then students are supposed to do enrichment learning activities: Type One, Type Two, and Type Three (Renzulli, 1977).

Type II: Enrichment- Group Training Activities

It is designed to develop higher-level thinking skills such as creative thinking skills, critical thinking skills, and emotional development which are related to individual and social development. In other words, it helps students to learn and become familiar with the process

of thinking. It also develops problem solving skills, exploration training, and researching skills. It develops functions regarding various learning methods such as sorting out of notes, interviews, classification of sources, analyses, and reaching to conclusions. It develops high-level functions to use reference resources such as reader's information, directories, and abstracts. Overall, through technology, effort, attitudes, and methods of research, students are able to deal more effectively with various problems which may occur in many areas of the students' lives. Most of these abilities and skills are indispensable in conducting individual research learning in the third stage. Participants of this programme are students who are classified as gifted or any other students. They can experience the basic and high-level training according to individual abilities and interests.

Various training activities which are dealt with in the second stage of enrichment learning are as follows:

Cognitive Training	Creative and critical thinking skills, problem solving skills, analysing skills, organisation skills, appreciation, and evaluation.
Learning Training (Exploring Abilities)	Analysing sources, organising interviews, examination of sources, sorting out notes and grasping the outline; listening, observation, perception, reporting, summarising.
Using Research and Resources Training (Reference Resources Using Abilities)	Library using abilities, making use of resources in local societies.
Communication Skills	Abilities to maximise the influences of results, that is, abilities in writing, speaking, visualisation (i.e. making tables)
Justice Training	<p>Relationships with Other Individuals: knowing how to maintain one's own opinions, developing the skills to resolve conflicts, improving leadership skills, understanding communications without verbal language, developing social skills, and understanding the environments that they are in.</p> <p>Personal Skills: knowing one's strengths and weaknesses, developing a sense of humour, developing the feeling of self effectiveness, developing self-confidence, raising the degree of self independence, developing the power of concentration on tasks, understanding integrity, understanding learning styles, understanding their hobbies, and understanding how to manage oneself.</p> <p>Coping with Problems: being adaptable to changes, learning techniques to handle stress, managing successes and failures, planning for the future, perfectionism, making ventures, learning the skills to make decisions, understanding dependence, and overcoming losses.</p>

Table 6.3: Training Activities for Type II (Renzulli, 1996; Huh, 2005).

Enrichment Types I and II are the preparatory steps to enable students to independently conduct enrichment learning Type III.

Type III: Enrichment- Individual and Small Group Investigations of Real Problems

Type III enrichment course is for gifted students to carry on an individual research project of actual problems. Learners who explore and produce activities are practically taking on the role of researchers or project directors, so that the students are able to actually think, experience, and conduct themselves as specialists. Teachers are given opportunities to choose the students to take part in this final stage for them to experience learning activities. The gifted students are to form a group or work individually, to systemise the problem concerned, to make a plan of how to conduct research, and to learn how to use the results. Teachers, simply as leaders, are encouraged to clarify the problems, to devise research methods, to help select materials and equipments, to inform where the resources are, and to link students to various specialists in the field. This emphasis in research in the students comes from Renzulli's (1996) belief that students are producers of knowledge rather than the consumers. Students are to elicit their own conclusions from raw data as main sources which have not yet been previously researched by others (Renzulli, 1996).

Suggested Activities for Enrichment Type III

Renzulli (1996, p. 24) suggests participation in various activities for students' advanced level competitions (i.e. Mathematics Olympiad), literature periodicals, student editions, comic books, and animation films. In this sense, opportunities for students to exercise or practice their creativities on every level are unlimited. Such outcomes of Type III enrichment programme provide students more motivation to "pursue advanced levels of understanding, scholarship and creativity" (Renzulli, 2000, p. 13-14).

The outcomes gained by enrichment learning Type I, II, III should be presented, freely debated, given feedbacks, written on all its processes, and evaluated. The evaluation should not be a traditional quantitative one, but a qualitative one which collects and evaluates every piece of information exposed in the process of teaching and learning process. The evaluation should be comprehensive and continuous in order to identify the individual student's holistic change and development process. The achievement evaluation method which is currently put in relief would also be a good method (Jun, 2000).

The three enrichment learning types of Renzulli and Reis' (1991, pp. 101, 104 and 118) models, examined above, are summarised below in Table 6.4.

	Type I Enrichment	Type II Enrichment	Type III Enrichment
Definition	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Experiences and activities in diverse studies. Extra-curricula activities in areas such as performance arts, debates, hobbies, people, place, incidents etc. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Developing teaching methods and sources designed for broad thinking and emotional development. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Learners as explorers or specialists think, experience, work, or explore artistic production processes.
Participants	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> All students Including students identified as gifted 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> All students Including students identified as gifted 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Individuals or small groups who want to participate in or are interested in special activities
Aims	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Making student's life richer by expanding their school experiences Stimulating new interests to identify independent research topics in enrichment Type III Teachers choosing Enrichment Type II activities for special groups of students 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Developing general skills such as creative and critical thinking, problem solving, emotional growth skills Developing diverse learning methods such as writing, interviewing, classification of sources, analyses, reaching conclusions, etc Developing skills for using reference resources such as introductory books, guide books, and summarised books. Developing communication skills 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Providing application opportunities for creative ideas, knowledge, interests, task concentration of chosen research areas Higher level of understanding knowledge and methodologies used in specific sciences, areas of artistic expression and academic research areas Developing productions which are influential to audiences Improving autonomic conducting abilities and teachers' interaction abilities
Main Concepts	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Experience new topics which are not dealt with in the regular curriculum Hosting powerful activities and events which stimulate new interests. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Development of data processing and thinking skills Familiarity in the scope and methods of data processing 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Individualised learning through practice Students' role changing from learners to researchers

Table 6.4: The Three Enrichment Learning Types of Renzulli and Reis' (1991, pp. 101, 104 and 118) Models.

Utilising the typical traits of the enrichment learning in Type III discussed above, an example Leadership Development programme and activity was formulated. Davis and Rimm (1989)

believed that when an enrichment curriculum being produced, the following objectives should be considered: maximum achievement in basic skills, contents beyond the national curriculum, exposure to various fields of study, student-selected contents, high content complexity, creative thinking and problem solving skills, development of thinking skills, attentive development, and motivation. These elements were taken into account in creating the Leadership Development programme as it is explained in Table 6.5:

Areas of personal interest	Type I Enrichment General Exploratory Experiences	Type II Enrichment Group Training Activities	Type III Enrichment Individual and Small Group Investigations of Real Problems	Products and Audiences for Type III Enrichment
Self-development Self-esteem and confidence-building personal and interpersonal promotion	Explanations by people in various areas Visits to where people work Leader in residence	Interviewing techniques Conducting interviews of leaders Making observations	Attending social activities Understanding social behaviour Learning about the women leaders of society and conflicting societies	Presentations to local or societies' state leader School and city newspapers, magazines, and articles
Social Development Interpersonal relationship Cooperation Writing Conversation	Lectures of invited leaders Communication with leaders through letters, videos, guest presentations	Descriptive statistics Data collection Research skills Analysis and evaluation Comparison and contrast	Working with the leadership researchers' team Understand the 21st century leadership society	Sending letters to the leaders of local society and the country Performances to primary students
Moral Development Personality education Religious education Moral and ethical education	Reading biographies Discussion with leaders familiar with literature Debate Visitations to historical houses or museums	Listening skills Speech skills How to record Guidelines to invite guest speakers or presenters	Understanding leadership Attending: researchers' meetings, book clubs, speech making societies, communication research team	Debate panel Editorial in school or local community newspaper Web pages Campaigns using posters
Leadership Development Rhetoric and speech Philosophical logic Moral Strength: • Personality education •Religious education •Moral, ethical education Leadership Ability Communication skills, Social skills Technical skills Conceptual skills. Web Design, Debate, Journalism. Knowledge Counselling, psychology, economy. Time management Leadership.	Learn about computer software Learn letter writing Learn to make effective telephone calls	Communication skills Decision making Defining the purpose of the activity and the potential audience Problem solving skill Logical, creative thinking skill Skills to make methodologies in different subjects	Attending: researchers' meetings, book clubs, speech making societies, communication research team journalists' group, advertisement group, game creation group, school or class newspapers making group Learn about the worldwide leaders The students talk to investigators Clubs discussing famous people and their sayings Students present their model leader	Professional handbook of leadership A speech contest Pop-up books Book of quotations for students

Table 6.5: The Contents of a Model Leadership Development Programme; Framework adapted from Renzulli (2000), Beane (1993) and Various Authors.

The above framework was made by adapting Renzulli (2000), Beane (1993), and various authors' ideas about the contents of a leadership development programme. The above Type I and Type II enrichment activities in the area of leadership were planned according to the six critical areas listed below (Renzulli, 2000, p. 12):

1. What do students with an interest in this area do?
2. What products do they create and/or what services do they provide?
3. What methods do they use to carry out their work?
4. What resources and materials are needed to produce high quality products and services?
5. How, and with whom, do they communicate the results of their work?
6. What steps need to be taken to have an impact on the intended audiences?

Types I and II enrichment stages concentrate on the first two questions above. Questions three to six can be applied for the students who have decided to research a specific theme or a field of study. Type III enrichment is conducted by "providing students with opportunities, resources, and encouragement to apply their interests, knowledge, creative ideas, and task commitment to a self-selected problem or area of study" (Renzulli, 2000).

6.6. Conclusion

Renzulli (1999) maintains that one of the obvious traits of his study is the synthesis of theory and practice. In other words, he attempted to apply the theory into practice in the idea or model regarding giftedness and development of giftedness (Park, 2000). The three type model starts from the general experiences in various subject areas which may stimulate students' interests gradually to deeper and higher levels of various contents and methodologies. Gifted students are then to apply leadership activities which they have learned from the leadership training programme to real experiences, and to have opportunities to develop diverse leadership skills by relating the experiences to self.

Moreover, a leadership training programme can develop human potentialities and provide basic needs such as belongingness and feeling of achievement (Park, 2007). The leadership training

programme stimulates students' debates, and helps them to gradually learn how to solve problems. The leadership training programme suggested by Richardson and Feldhusen (1986) guides students to learn leadership through experiences such as non-language communications, effective communications, introductions, writing letters, preparing speeches, establishing and clarifying personal or group's goal, planning councils, and playing the role of the president of a council. It is through these types of training that gifted students will understand the importance of leadership, the final aim of gifted leadership education, recognise their potential leadership abilities, learn knowledge and skills necessary for them to become efficient leaders, and develop their leadership through many environments both of and out of the school (Park, 2007).

In conclusion, in answer to the research question, 'How is the suggested model to be implemented?' the importance of implementation or formation of curriculum was written. This was followed by an overview of various types of gifted education programmes available. Then, another significant element of implementing a curriculum, the Korean gifted context was overviewed. In this respect, a basic background understanding of implementation of programmes was overviewed. Finally, the implementation of the suggested model was discussed in both curricular and programme level. Overall, there were therefore, three main suggestions for a new model leadership gifted curriculum in this thesis: firstly, the FALM was formulated for the basis for a model curriculum. Secondly, it was suggested that the FALM could be implemented in a curriculum. Thirdly, this thesis proposed that the FALM could also be implemented in a programme using Renzulli's Enrichment Triad Model implementation scheme.

Chapter 7: Conclusions

7.1. Summary of Research Findings

The main objectives of this study was to investigate leadership gifted education in the Korean primary school setting to make practical suggestions for the formation of a model leadership gifted curriculum and programme. The suggestions were formed on the bases of leadership gifted research, the current leadership gifted curricula/programmes, and the Korean gifted teachers' opinions and perspectives on the needs and the demands of Korean gifted education in context. The standpoints of the teachers in gifted education were explored through methodological triangulation of questionnaires and interviews.

This research aimed to contribute towards the development of Korean gifted students to become potential leaders. Korean gifted education is being more researched due to recently governmental interest. However, there is much research yet to be conducted, especially in leadership development in the Korean gifted. This research has been one of the first of its kind in Korea to specifically tackle how gifted students can be developed as leaders, not merely in an academic sense, but also in a social and personal sense through the emphasis that Korean gifted teachers put on character-building and moral education as a part of leadership education.

Based on the literature in this field, various research questions were formed and were systematically answered. Firstly, research question (a) regarding the diverse perspectives of, and the relationship between, the concepts of leadership and giftedness was posed to attain a background understanding of the principle focus of this thesis. In the first two chapters, the need for leadership education for the gifted were discussed using both Western and Korean literature; the reasons included the societies' need for gifted leaders (Eyre, 2004), the similar characteristics between leaders and gifted students (Karnes & Bean, 2001), and how gifted students tended to be chosen as leaders due to their leadership characteristics (Kim et al., 2004). Due to these reasons, many researchers expressed great value in leadership development in gifted students.

Chapter 2 also discussed the impact of the Korean culture on education, and the differences between the Western and Eastern cultures. It was found that the Korean culture strongly related leadership education with the gifted because it was commonly believed that gifted students were leaders and therefore, the main goal of gifted education was viewed as developing future leaders

(Jin & Cha, 2004; Kim et al., 2004). Thus, leadership education was considered as necessary as a part of gifted education in Korea.

Chapter 3 tackled the four main research questions (b-e), the first of which concerned the current Korean leadership gifted educational setting, which was followed by the adequacy of such education in Korea. These research questions served as the bases for the enquiry into the opinions of the teachers in order to survey the setting. The next research question was asked to assess the demand for leadership gifted development education in Korea. The research results revealed that 60% of the Korean teachers of the gifted believed that 10-30% of the gifted students possessed the potential to become leaders, showing that not many teachers believed that all gifted students had leadership abilities. However, the importance of leadership education for the gifted in the Korean culture was illustrated through the fact that 92% of the gifted teachers thought that gifted students should be trained and taught in leadership skills and 68% of the teachers believed that such leadership education should be conducted in schools.

With the knowledge of the demands of a leadership gifted curricula, the necessary components of a leadership gifted programme were asked of the teachers to aid the formulation of recommended contents for a model gifted curriculum and programme. The main finding was that there was a strong cultural emphasis on gifted students becoming future leaders, together with the societal significance put on moral education, which Korean teachers believed to be a necessary part of leadership education. The teachers believed that there are small percentages of gifted students who currently have leadership abilities in schools and therefore believed that leadership development programmes should be given to enhance these abilities in the gifted to prepare them to become the future leaders.³¹

As leadership education for the gifted was concluded as necessary by the teachers, research questions (f) and (g) were asked in Chapter 4 and 5 in order to devise a conclusive suggestive model from the analysis of the results, current leadership gifted curricula/programmes and leadership gifted research. From these three sources, a new model for leadership gifted education, the FALM was formulated. The model incorporated four main areas which needed to be enhanced for leadership development in the gifted: self-development, social development, moral development, and leadership development. Character development, included in the moral development category, was especially emphasised by the literature review of Korean culture and was also supported by the opinions of the teachers. The interviews also compounded the perspective that moral education should be an essential element in leadership development in a

society which values morality due to its Confucianism-rooted culture. In this sense, a model for the foundation of a leadership gifted programme or curriculum had been formulated according to the needs of the Korean culture; this led to the inclusion of what the Koreans believed were necessary elements in the model such as moral and character development. As this model is a conclusive encapsulation of much research and evidence in this thesis, this is the main suggestive framework which can be the foundation for a future leadership gifted curriculum or programme in Korea and more research in this area.

The suggested model was then further developed for its implementation in the Korean culture, and therefore, in Chapter 6, research question (h) was asked regarding the implementation of the FALM in a leadership gifted curriculum/programme as well as how cultural differences may influence its implementation, as a final means to assist the researchers in adopting the FALM as the grounds for a leadership gifted model in the Korean educational setting.

In this thesis, two suggestions were made regarding the implementation of the model in two main forms: in a curricular and a programme format. In a curricular sense, the model can form the basis for directing a subject lesson such as Mathematics or English so that it can emphasise the four main areas within the lessons (refer to the example activities in Chapter 5).

On the other hand, Renzulli's (1986) Enrichment Triad model was recommended as a suitable framework from which the FALM could be implemented on a programme level, specific to the Korean culture. The reasons for this choice were as follows: firstly, the programme is suitable for the development of leadership skills as this programme improves self-actualisation and creative productivity of the gifted by providing enrichment learning. Secondly, the model suits the Korean culture and educational setting as it emphasises the inclusiveness of all students at the initial stages of the programme. This is suitable for Korea as most parents in Korea are keen for their children to be included in a gifted programme as they believe that the education would help their children in entering university (Huh, 2005). Thirdly, Renzulli's Enrichment Triad Model is a widely known gifted programme which is practical, provides opportunities for development of various interest areas, discussion and is experience-based and does not limit teaching to a didactic style. Fourthly, the programme is based on activities and encourages self-participation and autonomic learning methods; the students are given the freedom to choose the content of what they are to learn and are encouraged to solve realistic problems and produce creative work. In this sense, as enrichment programmes are more practical and rich in diversity rather than being merely theoretical (Howley, Howley, & Pendarvis, 1986; Scheiver & Maker,

2003), they are suitable for kindergarten or primary school children as they will be able to incorporate learning experiences through events such as school trips, which will facilitate their awareness of society (Jin, 2005, p. 210). Finally, the enrichment programme was found to be effective in elementary and middle schools of the U.S., and most students who participated in the programme gave positive feedback as well as showing increased levels of creativity and academic achievement (Reis, Burns, & Renzulli, 1992).

In sum, in understanding the Korean culture and the needs of the Korean teachers of the gifted, a need for the development of leadership skills was identified. This led to the development of the FALM, suited for the Korean culture, including its emphasis in moral and character education, and suggested how it could be implemented as a programme through Renzulli's (1986) Enrichment Triad Model, which was found to be suitable for the Korean culture and education system.

7.2. Limitations and Recommendations for Future Research

In overview, there is relatively little research on giftedness, leadership and especially leadership giftedness in Korea. Within the research area of leadership, the focus is usually on adults, and developing leadership in children is a subject that is comparatively neglected. The current gap in these research areas in Korea, due to only a fairly recently developed gifted education (from the 1980's; refer to section 2.1.3.), can be clearly observed in the absence of a standardised method of identification of the gifted and leadership gifted students, and the lack of standardised guidelines for educators in making provisions for these students.

The current thesis aims to offer a sizeable contribution to the relatively under-investigated Korean research area of leadership giftedness. Nevertheless, it is important to recognise some of the methodological limitations of this study, predominantly apropos the sample used in data collection. Foremost, in regards to the sample size of the participant schools, only 50 schools took part which rendered the size of the study sample relatively small. Furthermore, the schools that participated were all located within the Gyeonggi province and the designated 'special city' of Seoul: the most populated province of South Korea and the country's capitol, respectively. Both districts exhibit a highly urban, metropolitan and crowded environment that is not characteristic of the panoramic milieu of South Korea. Moreover, only Korean national and state primary schools and Centres for the Gifted took part in this investigation, with independent schools declining participation in this research. Hence, any independent leadership gifted

curricula/programmes in place in such institutions could not be surveyed or taken into account when formulating the central proposals of the thesis. As a final point, only one gifted teacher from each school was sampled; admittedly, the sample constituted the directors of gifted education in their respective schools, but their opinions cannot be presupposed to account for the views of every gifted teacher teaching at the school.

In sum, these points illustrate that the opinions collected from the sample may not be representative of the opinions of the whole population of Korean gifted teachers. This limits the generalisability of the research conclusions which are in part earthed on the teachers' opinions. Therefore, future research is directed towards overcoming the limitations in data collection of this research by firstly, increasing the sample size to include more than 50 schools; secondly, investigating whether other regions outside the highly urban areas have different views towards leadership gifted education; thirdly, researching whether leadership gifted education is conducted in independent schools; fourthly, including more teachers from each school to participate in the questionnaire survey and investigating the differences from each schools may also give light to any disparity of opinions within the schools.


On a more general level, future research should concentrate on the establishment and continual development of formal and comprehensive curricula and programmes that are appropriate to the Korean educational context. Secondly, more research should be conducted in creating a systematic evaluative procedure that assesses the degree of effectiveness of a specific leadership development programme or curricula for gifted students. Thirdly, researchers should investigate whether gender and age differences affect how leadership training should be conducted. For instance, research into how leadership education could be changed to suit male or female gifted students could prove useful for higher efficacy in leadership training. Lastly, researchers and gifted teachers alike should endeavour to make provisions to support the development of leadership gifted students from a young age; much gifted literature recommends leadership gifted education to begin from an early age (Hollingworth, 1946; Kim, Yoon, & Kim, 2003; Wu & Cho, 1993). Hence, further research can be conducted regarding how such leadership training can be fit into the current Korean curriculum in primary schools. Also, should the FALM be the basis of a leadership programme for cultures other than in Korea, the cultural assumptions regarding leadership gifted students and the needs can also be assessed to modify the implementation of the FALM as a curriculum or programme as this research has also done. Furthermore, further research can be conducted for the modification and implementation of the FALM in different year groups such as a leadership gifted programme for middle or high

schools students.

In conclusion, South Korea urgently beckons leadership gifted researchers to develop a formal leadership gifted curriculum and programme that is comprehensive, systematic and practical. It should fulfil the principal objective of leadership programmes; to occasion students the opportunity to develop their leadership abilities (Sisk, 1985, p. 52) and to incite the leadership gifted students into reaching their potential of becoming high-achieving and morally-grounded leaders of tomorrow's generation.

Appendix I:

Figure A.1: The Current Structure of Gifted Education in South Korea. Adapted from Cho (2005 p. 41).



Appendix II:

Table A.1: Number of Students per Institution (2005)

Institutions (<i>Number</i>)	Primary	Middle School	High School	Total	Percentage (%)
Gifted Classes in Mainstream Schools (291)	5,735	3,311	910	9,956	32.2
Centres for the Gifted run by metropolitan and provincial school boards (264; 16 of which are affiliated with metropolitan school boards)	8,164	9,026	637	17,827	57.6
Centres for the Gifted run by with universities(23)	1,073	2,108	-	3,181	10.2
Total (578)	14,972	14,445	1,547	30,964	100.0
Ratio	48.4	46.6	5.0	100.0	

Appendix III:

Questionnaire of Teacher's Opinions on Gifted Leadership Education (QTOGLE) and the Covering Letter

Note: This survey was conducted in Korea through mail during March 2005.

Covering Letter

Receiver: Teachers in charge of gifted education.

Title: Investigation on the curriculum for leadership development of gifted students.

Sender: Researcher of the University of Durham, School of Education.

Dear teachers in charge of gifted education,

My name is Seung Hee Ahn and I am currently studying for a doctorate in Education in the University of Durham. I am writing to ask you if you would be willing to take part in the data collection that is central to my doctorate thesis.

The purpose of this research is to study the available curricula and programmes used in Korea to develop leadership in gifted primary school students and ultimately make suggestions to form and implement a model leadership gifted curriculum appropriate to the gifted primary school student. A questionnaire is attached which will identify your views on the current situation of the gifted and leadership education in Korea, and provide you with the opportunity to suggest ways of improving leadership in the gifted primary school students of Korea. Your opinions will be very valuable to my research.

I would be very appreciative for your participation. If you would prefer not to participate, you are free to do so and if you would like to withdraw your information after sending off your completed questionnaire, please contact me and this can be arranged. I would like to give you the assurance that the information collected will be kept fully confidential. If any further questions arise, please contact me and I will be more than happy to discuss any issues concerning my questionnaire and research.

Cordially,

Seung Hee Ahn

Postscript: I would be grateful if you sent back the completed questionnaire in the envelope provided and by the end of March, 2005.

QTOGLE:

Divided into four sections of Personal Information, Questionnaire I, Questionnaire II and Questionnaire III.

Personal Information

Workplace (Sampling School):

- Korean State Primary School
- Korean National Primary School
- Korean Independent Primary School
- Other

Teacher's Position:

- Head Teacher
- Assistant Head Teacher
- Head of Year Teacher
- The Class/Form Teacher
- Centres for the Gifted Teacher
- Other

Period of Teaching:

- Less than 5 Years
- 5-10 Years
- 10-20 Years
- More than 20 Years

Questionnaire I

1. Which area of giftedness do the gifted students of your school specialise?

- | | |
|--------------------------------------|---|
| Science <input type="checkbox"/> | Music <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Mathematics <input type="checkbox"/> | Physical Education <input type="checkbox"/> |
| General <input type="checkbox"/> | Others <input type="checkbox"/> |

2. How many gifted students do you have in each year group?

Years 1-2

Years 3-4

Years 5-6

3. Could you estimate the percentage of the gifted students who have leadership skills? %

4. How would you define leadership?

5. What are the main traits of leadership gifted students?

6. Do you think the class, 'leadership gifted' is a valid category of giftedness that should be identified within the gifted student population?

Yes

No

7. Do you think leadership skills can be taught/developed?

Yes

No

8. How far are good leaders born or made? In other words, to what extent are good leadership skills innate or acquired?

9. Do you have leadership development curricula for gifted students?

Yes

No

If so, what kind of curricula and programmes does your school use? Would you write down the details?

If your school has leadership curricula please answer the questions in the left column below (Questionnaire II). If not, please answer the questions on the right column below (Questionnaire III).

Questionnaire II

1. The leadership development curriculum or programme implemented at the school is:

Questionnaire III

1. Do you think that your students need leadership education at school?

An independent curriculum

Included in other subjects

If so, please state which:

2. What are the advantages and disadvantages of these curricula?

Advantages:

Disadvantages:

3. What content do you think should be added to these curricula?

4. How many hours do the students attend the courses per week?

5. From what year group does the leadership curriculum start?

Years 1-2 Years 3-4 Years 5-6

6. When do you think is the suitable age for students to begin leadership curricula?

Years 1-2 Years 3-4 Years 5-6

Middle School High School

University Post-University

7. Which area in the curriculum do you think is suitable for students?

Suitable area for students:

Unsuitable area for students:

8. Who is teaching this curriculum?

The Head Teacher

R.E. Teacher

The Class/Form Teacher

Yes

No

Could you write down the reasons?

If your school was to create a leadership education course:

2. What do you think should be included as an essential theme or content within the curriculum?

3. How many hours do you think the students should attend a leadership education per week?

4. When do you think is the suitable age for students to begin leadership curricula?

Year 1-2 Year 3-4 Year 5-6

Middle School High School

University Post-university

5. Who do you think should teach the course?

The Head Teacher

R.E. Teacher

The Class/Form Teacher

All Members of Staff

Several Members of Staff Working as a Team

Others

6. Do you believe that the moral education

All Members of Staff

Several Members of Staff Working as a Team

Others

9. What do you think should be included as an essential theme or content within the curriculum?

10. Do you think that there is enough moral education being taught at your school?

11. Do you think that your students need leadership education?

Yes

No

Could you write down the reasons?

12. What would you consider the aim of gifted education to be?

taught at your school is sufficient?

7. What do you believe the aim of gifted education to be?

Appendix IV:

Interview Records (Questions from the interviewer are written in italics).

Note: This interview was by conducted in Korea via telephone interviews during August 2005

a) An interview with Mr. Lee, a teacher at Mabuk Korea State Primary School.

1. What do you think is the most urgent necessity in the Korean gifted education scene, taking into account of the fact that gifted education is a boom in Korea recently?

Firstly, we need trained gifted teacher in each area. Secondly, I don't believe that teaching more knowledge to gifted students is as important as aiding them to develop and prepare themselves morally and as human beings.

2. a) Do you have any moral education and character education in your school?

We don't have an independent curriculum or a programme. However, I realise the importance of moral education. So, during the science and math sessions, I always try to devise ways and opportunities to improve their leadership skills.

2. b) How do you find the task of preparing for moral and character programmes by yourself?

I feel that I need more knowledge in this area of leadership which is why I started to learn more about it as a postgraduate student taking night classes.

3. What is your opinion on whether being gifted and being a leader is the same or different?

It is natural to link gifted students with leaders in Korea. It is also considered natural for intelligent gifted students to become educated as specialists in their fields.

4. What kind of plan do you have in the future as a gifted education programme teacher? Is there anything else you would like to add?

Gifted students may have skills and knowledge but they must first grow and develop as people to be contributing to the society as a leader. I feel that I have a duty to educate them to become well-mannered leaders who can care for others.

b) An interview with Ms. Park, a teacher at Seoul Yeonsan Korea State Primary School

1. What do you think is the most urgent necessity in the Korean gifted education scene, taking into account of the fact that gifted education is a boom in Korea recently?

Parents need to have a correct understanding of gifted education. Because of the general prejudice which leads most Korean parents to think that their students are all gifted, there are many difficulties such as entrance to a gifted school and development in gifted programs. There is another problem of having too many students in one class.

2. Do you have any moral education and character education in your school?

We don't have any moral education at all. In the present situation, for the past 3 years, we have only had 2-3 hours per week to barely satisfy their hunger for learning in mathematics and sciences.

3. What is your opinion on whether being gifted and being a leader is the same or different?

In my opinion, gifted students have a trait of thinking about themselves more considering others, so I cannot relate them to leadership skills.

4. What kind of plan do you have in the future as a gifted education programme teacher? Is there anything else you would like to add?

I would like to give them enough opportunities in education and to fulfil their learning desire. I will try to help them to contribute as good leaders in society.

Appendix V:

Interview Records (Questions from the interviewer are written in italics).

Note: This interview was conducted in person in Korea during August 2005.

Interview with Dr. Kim Meesook, Director, Office of Foundation and Policy; National Research Centre on Gifted and Talented Education; Korean Educational Development Institute.

1. What do you think is the most urgent necessity in the Korean gifted education scene, taking into account of the fact that gifted education is a boom in Korea recently

Since 2002, the government designated and supported education institutions for the gifted and the National Research Centre on Gifted Education. However, because we cannot depend solely on foreign research results, we feel the need for research in gifted education specifically in the Korean culture and education.

2. What specific area of research are you focusing on recently?

In 2003, we focused our research on gifted elementary school students' cognitive and affective characteristics and guiding strategies. In 2004, we put emphasis on cognitive and affective characteristics of and teaching strategies for the Korean junior high school gifted students.

As the result of the research, we found that gifted students are extremely creative, have lots of interest in other people, problem solving skills and leadership skills. This is why this year we are researching on methods of improving their creative problem solving skills, and strategies to develop their leadership skills.

3. What is your opinion on whether being gifted and being a leader is the same or different?

In Korean society, it is difficult to disassociate giftedness and leadership. We all tend to believe that gifted students will develop to be our future leaders. Although there are gifted students who are gifted only in a single area, we recognise and hope that they will become leaders in their own fields. Therefore, in the next few years, our institute is planning to search for methods to develop gifted students as leaders.

4. What do you think is the most important factor in teaching leadership education?

First of all, moral education and personal education are important for leadership education. In order to contribute back to society what they received through their education. They should be able to think of others, respect people and have a desire to serve others in leadership

5. *What kind of suggestions do you have as a pioneer gifted education researcher?*

As researchers in gifted education which recently began in Korea, those with interest in this area should work hard with a pioneering mission. Because there are so many more things to research about, those who are ready with a desire to research in this area, or those who have studied this area abroad should take charge in gifted students' research.

Appendix VI:

Questionnaire Results (44 Schools and 6 Centres for the Gifted)

Personal Information

The 50 teacher respondents of the questionnaire were from the following type of schools.

Sampling population: Korean State Primary School: 36 schools
Korean National Primary School: 8 schools
Korean Independent Primary School: 0 schools
Others: Centres for the Gifted: 6 schools

The participant teachers' positions are as follows.

Teachers' position: Head Teacher
Assistant Head Teacher: 2
Head of Year Teacher: 24
The Class/Form Teacher: 18
Centres for the Gifted Teacher: 6
Other: 0

Their teaching experiences are as follows.

Period of teaching: Less than 5 Years: 2
5-10 Years: 10
10-20 Years: 22
More than 20 Years: 16

Questionnaire I

1. Area of giftedness: **Science:** 38 schools
Music: 0 schools
Mathematics: 28 schools
Physical Education: 0 schools
General: 0 schools
Others: 2 schools (unspecified)

2. Each year group: **Years 1-2: 0 schools**
 Years 3-4 years: 40 schools
 Years 5-6 years: 49 schools

Respondents offered an alternative answer: **Middle School: 6 schools**
(all 6 were Centres for the Gifted).

3. Estimate the percentage: **1%: 4** **5%: 4**
 7%: 2 **10%: 12**
 15-20%: 12 **30%: 6**
 50%: 2 **60%: 2**
 80%: 2 **100%: 2**
 No answer: 2

4. How would you define leadership?

- Ability to act as a team leader with clear opinions
- Ability to assess information
- Ability to clearly express oneself
- Ability to communicate their opinions accurately to others
- Ability to encourage others to participate in a group
- Ability to help others in order to develop both themselves as well as others
- Ability to identify visions and ideals of a group and to indicate a paradigm for them to follow
- Ability to lead a group
- Ability to lead others so that others' abilities may be displayed
- Ability to manage certain resources in an autonomous and effective way
- Ability to organise various opinions in a group
- Ability to persuade
- Ability to persuade others with good communication skills
- Ability to solve problems
- Able to organise, analyse and integrate things well
- Charisma to draw people in and lead them
- Creativity, logical thinking, coping with tasks
- Democratic view, positive outlook and ability to lead others

- Efficiency
- Exceptional ability in at least one area
- Have a positive attitude towards their country and desire to work for its development
- Problem solving skills
- Those who start work before anyone else does

5. What are the main traits of leadership gifted students?

- A sense of humour
- Ability to accept others' opinions (open mindedness)
- Ability to accurately assess a situation
- Ability to accurately assess information
- Ability to accurately assess others' opinions
- Ability to get along with others
- Ability to lead others and to work towards solving a task
- Able to continue working until the end
- Analysis Skills
- Avid Reader
- Bright Personality
- Clear ideas
- Clear opinions of self
- Concentration skills
- Creative
- Critical and thoughtful
- Dedication
- Desire for justice
- Desire to help others less well off than themselves
- Diligence
- Efficiency
- Emotional
- Empathetic
- Enthusiasm for tasks
- Exceptional ability in at least one area
- Expresses own opinion
- Frank and open views

- Friendly
- Good personal characteristics
- Good listener
- Good listener and considerate of the feelings of others
- Good presentation skills
- Good social relationships
- Good social relationships with others
- Interest in others
- Lead in various activities
- Likes exercise
- Likes to lead
- Logical
- Observation skills
- Outgoing
- Positive mentality
- Problem solving
- Public speaking skills
- Put others before themselves
- Self-sacrificial in order to find the truth
- Sensitive
- Sociable
- Vibrant
- Will power

6. Identifying leadership gifted pupils:

Yes: 18 **No:** 32

7. Do you think leadership skills can be taught/developed?

Yes: 46 **No:** 4

8. How far are good leaders born or made?

Born: 4 **Made:** 22 **Both:** 24

9. Do you have leadership development curricula for gifted students?

Yes: 10 **No:** 40

If so, what kind of curricula and programmes does your school use? Would you write down the details?

- Howard Gardner's M1 Theory of Seoul University
- Korean Education Development Centre (KEDI) gifted education learning materials
- Aju University Science Gifted Research Centre materials
- One to one study

Questionnaire II

(10 replies)

1. The leadership development curriculum or programme implemented at the school is:

An independent curriculum: 1

Included in other subjects: 9

If so, please state which:

- Humanities
- Mathematics
- All subjects

Respondents offered two alternative answers:

- Included in activities rather than an academic subject
- Summer holiday camps

2. What are the advantages and disadvantages of these curricula?

Advantages:

- It is suitable for mathematics, science and leadership education.
- Detailed real life examples are used and are therefore provide practical and realistic experiences for the students.

Disadvantages:

- The nature of the curriculum is not systematic, coherent or organised.
- There is not a specific curriculum for leadership development and is often included in various activities.

- A leadership programme is needed because currently in Korea, there are only sciences and mathematics gifted education, current Korean gifted education does not focus on the cultivation of creativity.

3. What content do you think should be added to these curricula?

- Korean curricula are very theoretical. Thus, experimental research should be done by the educationalists to develop a more experimental and practical curricula that can be implemented.
- More directions, strategies or guidelines for teachers of gifted students would be useful.

4. How many hours do the students attend the courses per week?

2 hours: 6 3 hours: 2 5 hours: 2

5. From what year group does the leadership curriculum start?

Years 1-2: 0 Years 3-4: 7 Years 5-6: 3

6. When do you think is the suitable age for students to begin leadership curricula?

Years 1-2: 1 Years 3-4: 9
Years 5-6: 0 Middle School: 0
High School: 0 University: 0
Post-University: 0

7. Which area in the curriculum do you think is suitable for students?

Suitable area for students:

- The development of logical thinking skills
- The fact that there is a set content in the curriculum
- Working together with others to solve problems

Unsuitable area for students:

- It is not systematic and is not coherent
- The leadership curriculum does not involve moral education and does not develop social and emotional aspects of an individual.
- Does not have much in content.

8. Who is teaching this curriculum?

The Head Teacher: 0

R.E. Teacher: 0

The Class/Form Teacher: 2

All Members of Staff: 0

Several Members of Staff Working as a Team: 0

Others: Special Subject Teacher: 8

9. What do you think should be included as an essential theme or content within the curriculum?

Communication Skills

- Verbal skills
- Aid eloquence
- Reading comprehension

Skills when coping with problems

- Decision making
- Logical thinking
- Problem solving skills

Social Skills

- Ability to accept others
- Consideration for others
- Counselling skills
- Open mindedness
- Understanding others
- Social relationship skills

Personal qualities

- Diligence
- Earnestness
- Efficiency
- Independence
- Leadership

- Self control

Emotional

- Emotional development

Knowledge

- Ability to lead and command
- Distribution of roles within a team (Delegation)
- Duties and responsibilities of being a leader
- Economy
- Education for one's own specialist area
- Eloquence
- Ethical training
- Methods of self-expression of one's own opinions
- Moral education
- Problem solving
- Psychology
- Study of humanity

10. Do you think that there is enough moral education being taught at your school?

Yes: 0 **No:** 10

Respondents provided further comments:

- Moral education must begin at home
- Although there is not enough moral education taught at school, basic manners or habits are taught.

11. Do you think that your students need leadership education in school?

Yes: 8 **No:** 0

Respondents offered an alternative answer: **Not sure:** 2

12. What would you consider as the aims of gifted education?

Aims of gifted education are:

For the society and nation

- Contribute back to society what they received through their education
- Contribute to the development of the country
- Develop competitiveness and national strength
- To create leaders of society
- Train future workers for the society

For the world

- Contribute to humanity

For self development

- Achieve self-actualisation
- Act as a process to find the interest areas of gifted students
- Develop one's abilities to the maximum
- Provide sufficient opportunities in education for those with intellectual hunger
- Provide tailored education appropriate to each gifted individual's personality and aptitude level
- To develop creative and moral leaders
- To develop creativity
- To develop potential abilities within gifted students

Questionnaire III

(40 replies)

1. Do you think that your students need leadership education at school?

Yes: 26

No: 14

Could you write down the reasons?

Reasons why leadership gifted education *is* needed in schools

- Leadership skills are easier and quicker to learn in groups and they are therefore ideal to learn within the school setting
- Students are unaware of what a leader is or what skills it involves

- There are not many gifted leaders in society despite many gifted students
- To develop students into future leaders of society
- To encourage gifted pupils to cooperate for a common good
- To find future leaders who will be able to work as able leaders
- To nurture the leaders which our country needs
- To seek out leaders for the development of the society as a whole
- To train and teach students that they must use their knowledge for others in real life

Reasons why leadership gifted education is *not* needed in schools

- Leadership is a part of developing as a human and is not a form of knowledge, which is why it does not need to be taught in schools
- Leadership skills are implicitly included and taught in textbooks
- Leadership skills should be trained in everyday life rather than in school
- Not all pupils are leaders
- There is not enough time in schools

2. What do you think should be included as an essential theme or content within the curriculum?

Same as the answers in Questionnaire II, Question number 9.

3. How many hours do you think the students should attend a leadership education per week?

1-2 hours: 28 **3 hours:** 2 **4 hours:** 2
5 hours: 2 **No answer:** 6

4. When do you think is the suitable age for students to begin leadership curricula?

Years 1-2: 2 **Years 3-4:** 18 **Years 5-6:** 0
Middle School: 6 **High School:** 4 **University:** 0
Post-University: 0 **No answer:** 2

Respondents offered alternative answers:

Before nursery: 4 **Nursery:** 4

5. Who do you think should teach the course?

The Head Teacher: 2

R.E. Teacher: 0

The Class/Form Teacher: 8

All Members of Staff: 0

Several Members of Staff Working as a Team: 2

Others: Special Subject Teacher: 16

An Experienced Teacher or Researcher of Giftedness: 12

6. Do you believe that the moral education taught at your school is sufficient?

Yes: 4

No: 28

Not Sure: 6

No answer: 2

Respondents offered further comments:

- Schools only teach knowledge and there is no practical and realistic moral education for pupils both within school and at home.
- Student must receive education for decision making and choice making.
- Within gifted education, moral education is not compulsory for the teacher and is therefore not taught in detail or systematically across the nation.
- It is too theoretical.

7. What do you believe the aim of gifted education to be?

To conclude, the aim of gifted education is in order to aid gifted students in their process of self-actualisation and self-development of their potentials and to simultaneously prepare them for future social and national contribution as leaders. This is to become a good leader who can contribute their skills towards the good of the nation. Gifted students should be identified and educated so that their great abilities can aid the society as a whole.

Appendix VII:

Chapter 5.1. (Self-development Activities)

Activity A. Search for Self (Who am I?)

a. Introducing Yourself

(To the teachers)

The students would be given some time to reflect on themselves as individuals to fill in the sheets below to introduce themselves. After that, the students would be encouraged to introduce themselves to one another in the group and present some points they wrote down on their sheets. During this introductory session, the students should be persuaded to listen to others' speeches and form an attitude of respect towards others. The teachers should also encourage the less confident students to speak up with confidence during the discussion.

Activity 1

Who am I?

Name:

Nickname:

Please complete the rest of the sentences to describe yourself. Try writing down what comes to mind immediately and honestly rather than thinking about it for a long time.

1. My personality is
2. My capabilities are.....
3. My aim in life is.....
4. Things that I like to do are.....
5. Things that I do not like to do are.....
6. The work that I would most like to do is.....
7. The thing that is the most difficult for me currently is.....
8. The most appealing aspect of me is.....
9. The most memorable occasion in my life has been.....
10. I see myself as.....

Activity 2

a. *Imagine that someone is writing about you for a newspaper. How would you like to be described? (500 words)*

b. *What I Am Most Good At?*

Students become motivated when they like the work they are doing, when they feel that they have improved in their work, and have a sense of achievement, satisfaction and worth in what they are doing. In the next activity, the students will be presenting their favourite subjects, the subjects they feel that they are best at, their preferred sporting activities and so on. They will be recording the occasions when they had received praise from others and aimed to form future ambitions. In this context, when the students are asked which activity they are best at, the teachers should not understand this activity as one which the students perform excellently at but an activity, although trivial, which the students can do with confidence. The activities which may seem little to the students may not be so unimportant for some students. In the following activity, the students will be able to delve into thoughts about their talents, how to develop them, their interests and how their interests relate to their future occupations. During this activity, teachers should encourage and explain the questions to those students who are finding it difficult to discover their talents.

Activity 1

What I Am Good At

Name:

Nickname:

* Please list 3 things that you are good at in each category provided.

My subjects I am best at are-

My sports I do the best in are-

My favourite music is-

My favourite hobbies are-

My best skills are-

Something I want to be good at in the future is-

* Write down what others think you are good at or have praised you for.

Things my parents compliment me for-

Things my teachers compliment me for-

Things my teachers compliment me for-

* Could you down how you felt about this activity.

.....

Activity 2

Imagine that you are your best friend talking about you. What would your friend say?

What might your friend say about what you like doing and what you are good at?

What might they say about what you don't like doing and about what worries you?

A) Understanding and Expressing Emotions

In everyday life, humans experience a diverse range of emotions such as happiness, anger, sadness, joy, love, hate, fear, and frustration (Rodd, 1998). Chung, Im and Chung (2004) stated that understanding and expressing human emotions is essential in maintaining human relationships. Lame and Busse (1983) suggested that expressing emotions are also significant for good leadership as they believed that leadership is a combination of concern for task coupled with concern for people.

Through the following activity, the students will be encouraged to understand their own emotions by contemplating what would make them feel an emotion such as anger or make others feel anger. Through this, the participants are encouraged to think of the feelings of others and realise if they need to change how they express emotions for good social relationships. In this activity, the students will be able to examine their emotions, accommodate for the emotions that they feel, express their emotions in a healthy way.

Activity 1

Expression of Emotions

* Please write down how you would feel if you heard the following comments.

Type of Comment	Comment	My Feelings	My Reactions
Command	"Stop talking and do your work!"	e.g. became angry	e.g. became angry at mum but couldn't shout at her so complained about her cooking.
Threaten	"If you don't listen to what I say, you will be punished!"		
Cynical	"You are a compulsive liar."		
Criticism	"Can you not even solve this easy problem?"		
Comparison	"How come your brother's doing homework when you're watching TV?"		
Judgement	"You didn't do any work but sleep, didn't you?"		
Interrogation	"I know what you did. Tell me the truth."		
Interruption	"Be quiet! You don't know anything!"		
Flattery	"You are so gorgeous! I have never seen anyone as pretty as you!"		
Caution	"I am advising you as a friend. You should keep your promises."		

Activity 2

How Do I Feel?

(To the students)

We always have feelings, but these emotions are not static. If we go to a new party or if we meet new people, most of us tend to be shy and feel slightly uncomfortable. But, that doesn't mean that we are normally shy. We may feel shy at that time as we were in a new environment. In normal circumstances, we might be confident and brave. Through this activity, we will examine what we feel in everyday life.

* Imagine the times when you have felt some of these feelings. Write about each of the feelings listed below.

A time when I felt very brave was when.....

I felt excited when

I felt relaxed when.....

I felt nervous when.....

I felt happy when.....

I felt embarrassed when.....

B) Searching for a Good Self-Image

(To teachers)

In this activity, the students should be aided to think of those who care and help them so that they may realise that they are loved and appreciated as individuals. In addition, the students should be encouraged to have a grateful attitude towards those who have helped them grow up to become what they have become. The love and influence given by those who they care about should be thought of in detail. In particular, by thinking of those who have cared for them, the students should also think of those who they care for and slowly move on to share these feelings with others (refer to Curriculum 4: Appendix 5-4).

Activity 1

Good Self-Image

Name

Nickname

* Try writing down the people who care for me and think of the times when you have received help from them.

1. A person who loves me.....
2. A friend who cares for me.....
3. A person who cares for my health.....
4. A person who I shared my difficult times with.....
5. A person who helps me to think about my future.....
6. A person who gave me courage.....

* To people who cared for me:

1. How did I repay them in return?.....
2. How will I repay them in the future?.....

* Express your loved ones through a map/graph. Place yourself anywhere you wish on the page and draw males as squares and females as circles.

* How did you feel about the above activity?

Activity 2

*Imagine that you are going to tell your class or group about all the people that are important to you. What do you think the others would like to know about them?

*Draw a picture (a symbol) of one important person and write what they like to do. Why do you think they like to do this?

Activity B. Establishment of Self-Esteem

Activity 1

(To teachers)

This activity aims to find out what values the students are holding, so that they can have pride in what they believe and to plan for personal development. In this activity, the students are given a hypothetical situation of being given £100 each and they must split the money into 20 things that they value. Largest amount of money should be given to their largest value and the lowest amount of money to something that they value the least.

***Price Allocation of the Values that I Hold**

Name:

Nickname:

Important Value

The price I've allocated

- 1. Succeeding in dream career
- 2. Deep loving relationship
- 3. Freedom at work/in choosing work
- 4. Living in a fair, just and honest world
- 5. Understanding the meaning of life
- 6. One month of holiday to completely relax and enjoy
- 7. International reputation and Popularity
- 8. An opportunity to eradicate disease and suffering
- 9. Prejudice and discrimination-free world
- 10. Lifetime financial security
- 11. A satisfying religious faith
- 12. Your own personal space
- 13. Being appreciated as an individual
- 14. Being attractive
- 15. Happy family relationships
- 16. The confidence to live life in an optimistic manner.....
- 17. The love and respect of friends
- 18. The authority to have control over your country.....
- 19. Being autonomous (being able to control everything yourself).....
- 20. Satisfaction in marriage

* What were the five factors in life you valued the most in the above list?

1.

- 2.
- 3.
- 4.
- 5.

* How did you feel about the activity?

Activity 2

(To teachers)

Through the activities below, the students should be able to discover their capabilities and think about their future.

The Person I Want To Be

Name:

Nickname:

* Please write down the type of people we want to be (e.g. a wise person, a strong person, a responsible person).

* Please write down your reasons why you would like to be this type of person.

* Try making some practical strategies and plans as to how you can try to become more like the person you would like to be.

Activity C. Our Strengths and Weaknesses

(To teachers)

Everyone has strengths and weaknesses in their characters. However, there are times when we forget our strengths or weaknesses. Through this activity, the students' strengths and weaknesses should be uncovered and find ways to accommodate for them. Leadership can be

encouraged through aiding the students to understand others' weaknesses and their own strengths. Throughout this activity, the students should put too much focus on their weaknesses and therefore retract from doing this exercise.

Activity 1

My Strengths and Weaknesses

Name:

Nickname:

* What are my strengths?

At home-

In school life-

In my relationship with friends-

In my personality-

*What are my weaknesses?

At home-

In school life-

In my relationship with friends-

In my personality-

* How did you feel about this task?

Activity 2

(To teachers)

To disclose oneself is to reveal to others details about themselves, things that happened to them, and to reveal their feelings honestly to people in a comfortable manner. It is not an easy feat to express ourselves honestly to others. In the activity below, the students will be aided to adopt an attitude of honest expression of their feelings and thoughts to others. Such an exercise will encourage trust in human relationships and honest expression of emotions for harmonious relationships with others.

Self-Reflections (About Myself)

Name:

Nickname:

Please give yourself some time to think about these questions and try to answer the questions honestly.

1. What would I do if my parents gave me £50 to spend?
2. What is my favourite possession?
3. When was I saddened the most in my life so far? Why was I so sad?
4. What is my biggest strength?
5. What is my biggest weakness?
6. What worries me the most at this moment?
7. When did I need courage the most? Why did I need so much courage?
8. When do I feel the most confident?
9. When do I feel the most insecure?
10. Who is my role model? Why is he/she my role model?

Activity D. Planning for the Future (Sending a Letter to Self)

The following activities should introduce the students to seek for their own life goals and to plan for their futures. In order to aid the students to achieve their dreams, Activity 2 can be done and put up on a board for people to see one another's role models and future dreams.

Activity 1

Myself in the Future

Name:

Nickname:

1. Completing an Imaginative 'Myself in the Future.'

In this activity, please write down what you think your future self would be like. On the left, write down your hopes and aims and on the right, write down your future 'life story.'

Steps in Life	My Age	Aims	My life story
Now			
6 years later			
10 years later			
20 years later			
30 years later			
50 years later			

2. In order to realise your dreams, please write down your role model and your reasons why you picked him/her.

* My role model:

* Reasons why I chose him/her:

3. How did you feel about this activity?

Activity 2

Writing a Letter to Myself

(To teachers)

The students should have realised through the activities done in the past that they should respect themselves. Therefore, they should aspire to care for and love themselves even more. In this activity, the students will write a letter from their 'present selves' to their 'future selves' regarding what they want to tell their future selves, what they have been feeling until now, their plans about the future and how they are going to work towards achieving their dreams. In this section, the students should be able to contemplate about themselves as individuals in a determined sense about the future (refer to Curriculum 8: Appendix 5-8).

Letter to My Future Self

Name:

Nickname:

* Dear Future

Appendix VIII

Chapter 5.4. (Leadership Development Activities)

A. Activities for Leadership Development in Korean Gifted Primary School Students

The aims of each activity are:

1. To provide students the opportunity to understand the concept of true leadership.
2. To educate and encourage students that each has the capacity to become leaders.

In each activity, students should be encouraged to think and debate about the strengths and weaknesses of leaders in their society. From the debate the students can identify the skills involved in leadership. The debate can be followed by the teacher giving a brief talk on what leadership is and summarise the conclusive points of the debate.

Activity 1: What is Leadership? (Best Five Leaders)

Time: Approximately one hour.

Materials: Sheets of A4 coloured paper according to the number of students, sheets of large paper (A3 or A2) according to the number of groups, markers, sticky tapes, and background music.

Procedure:

- After students have been put into small groups, each group receives one large sheet of paper and each student receives one sheet of A4 coloured paper.
- Each student writes down his or her own ideas of what makes good and bad leaders in short sentences on the A4 coloured paper (5 minutes, with background music). These individual tasks will be more effective for shy and introspective students to express their opinions.
- In each group, students are told to present their views and through discussion choose five characteristics that make good leaders and bad leaders under each heading in the following format (10 minutes, with background music):

What makes a:	Good Leader?	Bad Leader?
---------------	--------------	-------------

1.		
2.		
3.		
4.		
5.		

- Each group leader presents their table (20 minutes).

Feedback:

- The teacher summarises the student’s points and then supplies any concepts of leadership that were not touched upon as a result of the group work.
- The teacher explains incorrect beliefs and myths regarding leadership and re-establishes more accurate views on leadership. He or she can give a talk on the myths and crucial components of leadership, which is described in more detail in the following activity.

Activity 2: Breaking of Leadership Myths

The purpose of this activity is to reaffirm that each student can be good leaders in various fields by helping them to be aware of and dispel the myths in leadership (Woo, Kim, Kim, & Lee, 2003, pp. 137-138).

Myth #1. Leadership is a rare skill.

Although some people learn more quickly how to lead than others, it is generally accepted that most people have leadership skills which can be developed (Woo, Kim, Kim, & Lee, 2003).

Myth #2. A leader is born with leadership.

Some believe that leadership is entirely innate. However, recent studies show that various skills which were commonly related to leadership such as social and conversation skills are not requisite qualities of a leader (Woo, Kim, Kim, and Lee, 2003).

Myth #3. Leaders should have charisma.

It was frequently assumed that good leaders have excellent skills in conversation and personal relationships. However, in many cases, leaders were found to be silent especially if they are

leading others 'behind the scenes'.

Myth #4. Leaders should be at the head of an organisation.

People think that a leader is usually a leader of an organisation as the chairman or the president. Although head of organisations are leaders themselves, if a member is specialised in a specific area or is trusted by others due to his or her perseverance and positive outlook, he or she can also be defined as leader. Leaders, therefore exist in any position in any field or organisation.

Myth #5. A leader should control, direct and manage.

The teacher can give the following statement to the students and encourage discussion amongst themselves: 'If leaders gives [a] dream[s] to the members, share effectively in the dream[s] with other members, and commit themselves to the dream[s], leaders need not force other members to conform to their arbitrary directions'.

Notes

¹ Other traits common to both the gifted and leaders are: the ability to learn languages; critical thinking skills; creativity; attempting challenges; responsibility; desire for self-fulfilment (Black, 1984; Karnes & Bean, 2001; Plowman, 1981).

² For instance, the Education Department of United States stated that giftedness is not only limited to academic intelligence, but can be seen in strong motivation for achievement, sociability, and leadership qualities (Marland, 1972).

³ Gardner (1995) observed that there were direct and indirect modes of leadership where indirect leaders set examples to the rest of the group through their work. These were “individuals who come to be recognized as leaders because of the innovative and exemplary nature of their contributions to and within their own domains of endeavour” such as Beethoven or Einstein (Parker & Begnaud, 2004, p. ix). Direct leaders include those who lead nations or are heads of corporations or organisations (Parker & Begnaud, 2004; Refer to Chapter 2.2.3.).

⁴ Freeman, J. (2003, 7 April). *Gifted children*. Lecture delivered at the University of Durham, UK.

⁵ (S. H. Cho [Director of Gifted Education in the Korean Education Development Institute], personal communication, 25 February, 2004).

⁶ Roid (2000) stated that each factor reflects “a different learning style in the sense that an individual with a relative strength in one factor may prefer to learn in ways that emphasise the ability assessed through that factor” (as cited in Smith, n.d., p. 1-2).

⁷ Such procedures had to be taken as it is the Korean custom to reply only when they have been personally contacted.

⁸ Only 13 out of the 20 categories were used in categorising the teacher responses in terms of the components of leadership development curriculum or programme.

⁹ Due to the change in the Korean law in 2002, it was made legal that the nation’s head of gifted education teachers should receive a minimum of 60 hours of training before teaching gifted students. Hence, the gifted education teachers were to go through a short period of training, but there were only a limited number of those who did so.

¹⁰ For example, in Israel there are no special courses on gifted education at university level, but they created gifted education programs and highlighted self-study through workshops regarding teaching the gifted.

¹¹ Gifted interest centres were established within mainstream school for 12-17 year old middle school students. Whilst students utilise formal programmes within mainstream schools, the students simultaneously get training and education in their chosen subject area in the gifted interest centres. Four schools established music centres, 16 language centres, 1 agricultural centre, 1 gymnastics centres, and 25 technology centres. 70 other excellence centres were also formed. These types of centres are similar to that of Israel’s Wiseman’s science research centre, especially their gifted youth education centre and that of Russia’s Palaces.

¹² (S. H. Cho [Director of Gifted Education in the Korean Education Development Institute], personal communication, 25 February, 2004).

¹³ In discussing the different values between east and west, the Chinese culture is mentioned as an example of eastern cultures but Korean culture has many similarities with the Chinese culture.

¹⁴ However, when children start school, teachers and friends also become important in affecting their self-esteem.

¹⁵ However, Dweck (2000) emphasised the dangers of praise for children’s performance or the intelligence of students may lower their motivation to learn. This is because praise regarding one’s intelligence may lead the

student to pressure themselves to not fail in their academic performance. Conversely, praise for effort leads the student to try harder their next task, should they face an academic failure. Thus, even when the student has not been particularly successful at a task, it is important for the parents and the teachers to praise the students in their efforts rather than their performance (Chung, Im, & Chung, 2004; Dweck, 2000).

¹⁶ A child's self-esteem may be increased if they are treated with respect. This can be done by explaining everything by the teachers to the students. There also is a need for teachers to explain to the students about other students' behaviours. Through explaining why a student may have acted a certain way, the students will be able to understand themselves as respected people. They should also be treated as intelligent individuals who are able to understand and reach their own conclusions. Showing respect for the opinions and decisions of students is one way to help them believe that they are respected. In addition, the teachers should aim to not ignore, shout, patronise and belittle the students in front of others as this may lower their self-esteem.

¹⁷ In Korean culture, the significance of *chemyeon* increases people's awareness in the words they say as Koreans consider what others would feel if they had to say something honestly. Hence, this is why the Korean culture generally, prevents people to fully express themselves to others in the fear that others will dislike their comments or that they will ignore them. Thus, many Koreans have to learn how to match their emotions with their actions. When they express their thoughts to others, they should do this with wisdom and honesty (Chung et al., 2004).

¹⁸ The level of confidence and self-confidence can be assessed through rating the following statements in a questionnaire: There are times when I wish I was another person; there are many aspects of me which needs to be changed; I am not indecisive and can be determined or resolute at times; I give up on things that I need to do easily; it is difficult for me to express my real self to others; there are times when I am embarrassed of myself; there is nothing for me to be proud of; if there are things that need to be said, I usually say it; I cannot be a reliable person for other people.

¹⁹ The statements regarding their attitudes towards their relationship with friends and others, their social skills, social relationships and social self-concepts are: I have a lot of fun with others; it is very difficult for me to become close to new people; I am quite popular among friends my age; my friends usually do as I say; I am not as good looking as other people; I am not very loved compared to others.

²⁰ The statements regarding the 'familial self' are: I am easily angered at home; I expect too much from my family; my family is able to recognise my emotions and feelings; there are many occasions when I want to move out of my house; my family understands me well; I think my family hates me sometimes.

²¹ One's character in school can be assessed through statements such as: I find it difficult to stand up in front of the class and speak; I am afraid that I will be questioned at school during class; there are times when I am very disappointed with my school; there are not many occasions when school life bothers me.

²² One's religious self can be assessed through statements such as: I feel that I need help every time I have a problem; there are times when I feel that I am being helped by someone; I sometimes feel limited when making decisions; I feel the urge to pray at times.

²³ One's social relationship with others can be examined through the following statements: I am able to understand my friends on a deep level; I find it difficult to speak first to a new friend; I sometimes feel very disappointed because my friends do not understand me as much as I understand them; I normally compliment my friends a lot; when I talk to my friends, I keep my manners; there were occasions when I swore in front of my friends; I have many friends who I can talk to; when I argue with my friends, I apologise first; I think that my friends are teasing me.

²⁴ Other social characteristics of leadership gifted students are: becoming intimate quickly with strangers, making friends easily, are familiar with personal likes and dislikes of other people, feeling sympathy for others, preferring to play with others than alone, showing deep concerns for diverse countries, being responsible and carrying out prearranged promises, having a high level of self-confidence, liked by peers, expressing their thoughts efficiently, and

are well-adjusted to new settings.

²⁵ Mammonism refers to the love of pursuit of wealth and triumphalism is the belief that a specific culture or society is superior to others. Communitarianism is the belief that the interests of communities/societies should be considered before those of individuals.

²⁶ It does not generate students' interests as teachers simply explain the definitions of good behaviour, service, honesty, truth, goodness, beauty, accomplishment, loyalty, filial duty, etc.

²⁷ Teachers should avoid making non-interactive teaching plans as it is through the process of reading that students reinforce characteristics such as perseverance and responsibility rather teaching set values on various issues. Thus, teachers should choose books regarding moral virtues and values rather than controversial moral issues (Hall, 2000).

²⁸ Education derives from the Latin word 'educio' which means to draw out. Hence, education is a process in which one draws something out for practice.

²⁹ Four steps can be taken to elicit values via careful and sufficient debates (Rath, Hamin, & Simon, 1994, pp. 182-199). Firstly, teachers should suggest to students a tangible topic implying the important value by making a use of a visual aid which stimulates students' interests. Sources can be drawn on the blackboard, presented by pictures, copied and handed out to the whole class. Teachers lead students to the debate by choosing and utilizing items relevant to the subject among the sources. Secondly, students are encouraged to think for a few minutes regarding the question and to write the down before speaking. Students who tend to copy other students are to be separated and given time to think individually before debating. Thirdly, the teachers should ensure that all the students are participating. Fourthly, students should elicit what they have learned.

³⁰ In addition, they realise the level of their own abilities, examine their shortcomings, and see if it is possible to correct them (Chung & Chung, 2004). Kim and Choi (2005) also emphasised the perseverance in leaders to analyse and reform themselves through various assessments and feedbacks. Overall, leadership ability may be demonstrated in various activities such as sports, school newsletters, science exhibitions, boy/girl scouts and other school and extracurricular activities.

³¹ Such belief that gifted students are more capable of becoming leaders of societies is not only inherent in the Korean culture as it is a universal conception that gifted children have the potential to develop into to become leaders (Dabrowski, 1972; Piechowski, 1991).

Bibliography

- Adler, M. J. (1982). *The Paideia Proposal: An educational manifesto*. New York: Macmillan.
- Adler, M. J. (1983). *Paideia problems and possibilities: A consideration of questions raised by The Paideia Proposal*. New York: Macmillan.
- Agosto, E. (2005). *Servant Leadership: Jesus and Paul*. St. Louis, MO: Chalice Press.
- Ahn, T. Y., & Kim, B. T. (1993). *Women's professional leadership development programme evaluation research*. Seoul: Ministry of Education and Human Resources & Korea Academic Promotion of Korea (in Korean).
- Amabile, T. M. (1996). *Creativity in context*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.
- Anderson, L. W. (1995). Theories and models of teaching. In L. W. Anderson (Ed.), *International Encyclopaedia of Teaching and Teacher Education* (2nd ed., pp. 89-91). New York: Pergamon.
- Argyle, M. (1972). *The psychology of interpersonal behaviour* (2nd ed.). Harmondsworth: Penguin.
- Bagley, W. C., (1922) Educational determinism: Or democracy and the IQ. *School and Society*, 16, 373-384.
- Bain, S. K., Bourgeois, S. J., & Pappas, D. N. (2003). Linking Theoretical Models to Actual Practices: A Survey of Teachers in Gifted Education. *Roeper Review*, 25(4), 166-172.
- Baldwin, A.Y., & Vialle, W. (1999). *The many faces of giftedness: Lifting the masks*. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.
- Baldwin, A.Y., & Vialle, W. (1999). *The many faces of giftedness: Lifting the masks*. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.
- Bang, H. C. (2006, 26 August). Mr. Sung Won Min Spreads the Principle of Study. *Chosun News*. Retrieved 26 August, 2006, from news.chosun.com (in Korean).
- Barbe, W. B., & Renzulli, J. S. (1975). *Psychology and education of the gifted*. New York: Irvington.
- Barnperson, C. A. translated by Kang, Y. A. (1994), *Culture in the stream of rapid change*. Seoul: Seowangsa (in Korean).
- Barry, V. E. (1985). *Applying ethics: A text with readings*. Belmont: Wadsworth.
- Bass, B. M. (1985). *Leadership and performance beyond expectations*. New York: Free Press.
- Bass, B. M. (1990). From Transactional to Transformational Leadership: Learning to Share the Vision. *Organizational Dynamics*, 18, 19-31.
- Beane, J. A. (1991). The Middle School: Natural Home of Integrated Curriculum. *Educational Leadership*, 49(2), 9-13.

- Beane, J. A. (1991). The Middle School: Natural Home of Integrated Curriculum. *Educational Leadership*, 49(2), 9-13.
- Benbow, C. P. (1986). SMPY's model for teaching mathematically precocious students. In J. S. Renzulli (Ed.), *Systems and models for developing programs for the gifted and talented* (pp. 1-25). Mansfield Center, CT: Creative Learning Press.
- Benbow, C. P. (1992). Progress in Gifted Education - Everywhere But Here! *Gifted Child Today (GCT)*, 15, 15-19.
- Bennis, W. G. (1984). The Four Competencies of Leadership. *Training and Development Journal*, 38(8), 14-19.
- Berg, B. L. (2001) *Qualitative research methods for the social sciences*. Needham Heights: Allyn & Bacon.
- Bernal, E. M. (1979). The education of the culturally different gifted. In A. H. Passow (Ed.), *The gifted and the talented: Their education and development. Seventy-eighth yearbook of the national association for the study of education: part 1* (pp. 395-400). Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Bigger, S., & Brown, E. (1999). *Spiritual, moral, social and cultural education: Exploring values in the curriculum*. London: David Fulton.
- Bisland, A. (2004). Developing Leadership Skills in Young Gifted Students. *Gifted Child Today (GCT)*, 27(1), 24-27.
- Black, J. D. (1984). *Leadership: A new model particularly applicable to gifted youth*. Indiana, PA: ERIC Clearinghouse on Handicapped and Gifted Children. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED253990)
- Black, P. (1998). *Testing: Friend or foe? Theory and practice of assessment and testing*. London: Falmer Press.
- Bloom, B. S. (Ed). (1974). *Taxonomy of educational objectives*. New York: McKay
- Bonshek, J., & Walters, B. (1998). The Structure of Provision for Very Able Children: A Case Study of One LEA. *Gifted and Talented*, 2, 23-31.
- Borland, J. H. (2003). The death of giftedness: Gifted education without gifted children. In J. H. Borland (Ed), *Rethinking gifted education* (pp. 105-124). New York: Teachers College Press.
- Brandwein, P. F. (1981). *The gifted student as future scientist*. Ventura County, CA: National/State Leadership Training Institute.
- Brause, R. S. (2000). *Writing your doctoral dissertation*. London: Falmer Press.
- Brody, L. E., & Benbow, C. P. (1987). Accelerative Strategies: How Effective Are They for the Gifted? *Gifted Child Quarterly*, 31(3), 105-110.
- Brody, L. E., & Stanley, J. C. (1991). Young college students: Assessing factors that contribute to success. In W. T. Southern & E. D. Jones (Eds.), *The academic acceleration of gifted children* (pp. 102-132). New York: Teachers College Press.

- Brooke-Smith, R. (2006) The experience of the national academy for gifted and talented youth (NAGTY) U.K.: Development of policy and practice in schools in England. The English model. *International symposium on promoting gifted education and school innovation*, 11-24.
- Bryman, A. (1992). *Charisma and leadership in organizations*. London: Sage.
- Burns, J. M. (1978). *Leadership*. NY: Harper & Row.
- Byram, M. (1989) *Cultural Studies in Foreign Language Education*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Callahan, C. M. (2000). Evaluation as a critical component of program development and implementation. In K. A. Heller, F. J. Mönks, R. J. Sternberg & R. F. Subotnik (Eds.), *International handbook of giftedness and talent* (2nd ed., pp. 537-547). Oxford: Pergamon.
- Cawood, J. (1984). *The modern school's role in socialising the gifted student leader*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Stellenbosch, South Africa.
- Cawood, J. (1992). Student Leadership in Schools: Benevolent or Malevolent. *Gifted Education International*, 8(1), 32-35.
- Chao, R.K (1993). East and West, Concepts of the self as reflected in mother's reports of their child rearing, unpublished manuscript, University of California, Los Angeles.
- Chazan, B. (1994). *Contemporary Approaches to Moral Education*. (J. H. Park, Trans.). Seoul, Heong Sul Press (in Korean). (Original work published 1985).
- Cho, S. H. (1995). Conception of Giftedness and Gifted Education: A Pyramid Model. *Journal of Gifted/Talented Education*, 5(1), 1-32 (in Korean).
- Cho, S. H. (2000, April). *Current state of art in Korean education for the gifted in math and research*. Presented at the 18th annual conference of the Mathematical Education Symposium. Seoul National University, Korea (in Korean).
- Cho, S. H. (2002a). Identification and screening of the gifted. Busan In Board of Education (Ed.). *Theory and practice of gifted education*. Series of Busan Education. Busan: Busan Research Center for Educational Science (in Korean).
- Cho, S. H. (2002b). The Blind Point of Egalitarian Education and Gifted Education. *Korean Educational Development Institute Journal*, pp. 28-35 (in Korean).
- Cho, S. H. (2005). Korean educational strategies for the gifted and talented. *Symposium for Advanced Education and Gifted Education Policies* (pp. 23-52). Seoul: Korean Educational Development Institute Press (in Korean).
- Cho, S. H. (n.d.). *Definition and characteristics of the gifted*. Retrieved 14 September, 2006, from <http://moolynaru.knu.ac.kr/gifted/giftedindex.htm> (in Korean).
- Cho, S. H., Kim, H. W., Park, S. I., & Chung, H. C. (2002). *Comprehensive Plan for Gifted Education Promotion (CR2002-56)*. Seoul: Korean Education Development Institute Press (in Korean).

- Choi, A. K. (2002). *Understanding and Practice of Human Relations*. Seoul: Mu York Giong Press (in Korean).
- Choi, B. G. (2007, 20 February). The focus of overseas gifted education being the development of diverse abilities. *Korea News*. Retrieved 20 February, 2007 from news.korea.com (in Korean).
- Choi, H. S. (2003). Critical examination on the judgment of gifted secondary students and education programme. Thesis of the Autumnal Conference of the Korean Gifted Society (unknown page number). Seoul: The Korean Gifted Society (in Korean).
- Choi, S. C., & Kim, K. B. (1998, August). The psychological structure of chemyeon. Presented at The annual congress of the Korean psychological association, Seoul (in Korean).
- Choi, S. C., & Kim, K. B. (2000). The Psychological Structure of Chemyeon. *Korean Journal of Psychology: Society and Personality*, 14(1), 185-202 (in Korean).
- Choi, S. C., & Kim, K. B. (2004). Chemyeon: Social Face in the Korean Culture. *Korean Journal*, 44(2), 30-51 (in Korean).
- Choi, S. C., & Lee, S. J. (2002). Two Component Model of Chemyeon-Orientated Behaviours: Constructive and Defensive Chemyeon. *Journal of Cross-cultural Psychology*, 33(3), 332-345.
- Chung, B. M. (1984). *A sense of value and education*. Seoul: Bae Yong Sa (in Korean).
- Chung, C. Y. (2006). Why Servant Leadership? *Korean Journal of Logos Management Society*, 4(2), 1-23 (in Korean).
- Chung, E. H. (2004). Culture, Interpretation, and Education, Korean Heidegger. *Research Journal (the Heidegger Academic Society)*, pp. 67-94 (in Korean).
- Chung, M. J., Lee, S. J., & Lee, S. C. (2003). *Counselling Cases and Guide Programme of Leadership Education for the Gifted*. Seoul: Resources of Gifted Leadership of the University of Gunkuk (in Korean).
- Chung, M. R. (2005). *How to transform average teens into gifted teens*. Seoul: Golden Bough (in Korean).
- Chung, S., Im, H. S., & Chung, C. K. (2004). *An introduction into children's gifted education*. Seoul: Chung Song (in Korean).
- Chung, T. I., & Lee, W. G. (1986). *Human relationship education programme*. Seoul: Bo Jin Jay (in Korean).
- Chung, W. C. (2007, 13 February). Korean education on its deathbed...four years without reformation. *Chosun News*. Retrieved 13 February, 2007, from news.chosun.com (in Korean).
- Clark, B. (1986). The Integrative Education Model. In J. S. Renzulli (Ed.), *Systems and models for developing programs for the gifted and talented*, (pp. 57-88). Connecticut: Creative Learning Press.
- Clark, B. (1997). *Growing up gifted: Developing the potential of children at home and at school* (5th ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Merrill.

- Clark, B. (2002). *Growing up gifted: Developing the potential of children at home and at school* (6th ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Merrill Prentice Hall.
- Cohen, L., Manion, L., & Morrison, K. (2000). *Research Methods in Education* (5th ed.). New York: RoutledgeFalmer.
- Coleman, L. J., & Cross, T. L. (2001). *Being gifted in school: An introduction to development, guidance and teaching*. Texas: Prufrock Press.
- Connerley, M. L., & Pedersen, P. B. (2005) *Leadership in a diverse and multicultural environment*. London: Sage.
- Coopersmith, S. (1967). *The antecedents of self-esteem*. San Francisco, CA: W. H. Freeman.
- Cornell, D. G., & Grossberg, I. W. (1987). Family Environment and Personality Adjustment in Gifted Program Children. *Gifted Child Quarterly*, 31(2), 59-64.
- Csikszentmihalyi, M. (1991). *Flow: The psychology of optimal experience*. New York: Harper Perennial.
- Csikszentmihalyi, M. (1999). Implications of a systems perspective for the study of creativity. In R. J. Sternberg (Ed.), *Handbook of Creativity* (pp. 313-35) Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Curry, N., & Johnson, C. (1990). *Beyond self-esteem: Developing a genuine sense of human value*. Washington, DC: National Association for the Education of Young Children.
- Dabrowski, K. (1972). *Psychoneurosis is not an illness*. London: Gryf.
- Daft, R. L. (2002). *The leadership experience*. Ohio: South-Western.
- Dalglish, T. (2002). *Self-esteem: Activities and ideas to develop children's self-esteem, across the curriculum*. London: A&C Black.
- Davis, G. A., & Rimm, S. B. (1985). *Education of the gifted and talented*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Davis, G. A., & Rimm, S. B. (1994). *Education of the gifted and talented* (3rd ed.). Needham Heights, MA: Allyn & Bacon.
- Davis, G. A., & Rimm, S. B. (2001). *Education of the gifted and the talented*. Seoul: Hak Mun Sa.
- Davis, G. A., & Rimm, S. B. (2004). *Education of the gifted and talented* (5th ed.). Boston: Pearson Education.
- Dean, J. (2000). *Improving children's learning*. New York: Routledge.
- Delisle, J. R. (1996). Multiple Intelligences: Convenient, Simple, Wrong. *Gifted Child Today (GCT)*, 19(6), 12-13.
- Delisle, J. R., & Galbraith, J. (2002). *When gifted kids don't have all the answers*. Minneapolis: Free Spirit.

Denton, C. & Postlethwaite, K. (1985). *Able children: Identifying them in the classroom*. Berkshire: NFER-NELSON.

DfEE (2000). *Curriculum 2000 English*. London: HMSO.

DfEE (2000). *Curriculum guidance for the foundation stage*. London: Qualifications and Curriculum Authority.

Donnellan, C. (2003). *Self-esteem*. Cambridge: Independence.

Downton, J. (1973). *Rebel leadership: Commitment and charisma in the revolutionary process*. New York: Free Press.

Drucker, P. R. (1996). Foreword: Not enough generals were killed. In F. Hesselbein, M. Goldsmith & R. Beckhard (Eds.), *The leader of the future: New visions, strategies, and practices for the next era* (pp. xi-xv). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Dweck, C. S. (2000). *Self-theories: Their role in motivation, personality, and development*. Philadelphia, PA: Psychology Press.

Eagly, A. H. (1987). *Sex differences in social behaviour: A social-role interpretation*. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

Education Office of Gyonggi Province. (1988). *Character education school inspector's source*. Gyong Gi Province: Mun Sung Sa (in Korean).

Eklöf, M. (1987). Discover the Specialness in Each Child. *PTA Today*, 12(7), 4-7.

Emler, N. (2001). *Self-esteem: The costs and causes of low self-worth*. York: Joseph Rowntree Foundation.

Eyre, D. (1997). Teaching Able Pupils. *Support for Learning*, 12(2), 60-65.

Eyre, D. (2004, September). *The English model of gifted and talented education*. Paper presented at the European Conference of High Ability, Pamplona, Spain.

Eyre, D., & McClure, L. (2001). *Curriculum provision for the gifted and talented in the primary school*. London: David Fulton.

Fasto, D. (2001). An Analysis of Multiple Intelligences Theory and Its Use With the Gifted and Talented. *Roeper Review*, 23(3), 126-130.

Feldhusen, J. F. (1992). Early Admission and Grade Advancement for Young Gifted Learners. *Gifted Child Today (GCT)*, 15(2), 45-49.

Feldhusen, J. F., & Jarwan, F. A. (2000). Identification of gifted and talented youth for education programs. In K. A. Heller, F. J. Mönks, R. J. Sternberg & R. F. Subotnik (Eds.), *International handbook of giftedness and talent* (2nd ed., pp. 271-282). Oxford: Pergamon.

Feldhusen, J. F., & Kennedy, D. M. (1988). Observing the Nature and Emergence of Leadership Talent Among Gifted Youth. *Gifted Child Today (GCT)*, 11(6), 2-7.

Feldhusen, J. F., & Kennedy, D. M. (1988). Preparing Gifted Youth for Leadership Roles in a Rapidly Changing Society. *Roeper Review*, 10(4), 226-230.

Feldhusen, J. F., & Kolloff, P. B. (1986). The Purdue three stage enrichment model for gifted education at the elementary level. In J. S. Renzulli (Ed.), *Systems and models for developing programs for the gifted and talented* (pp. 126-152). Mansfield Center, CT: Creative Learning Press.

Feldhusen, J. F., Asher, J. W., & Hoover, S. M. (1984). Problems in the Identification of Giftedness, Talent, or Ability. *Gifted Child Quarterly*, 28(4), 149-151.

Feldman, D. H. (1999). The development of creativity. In R. J. Sternberg (Ed.), *Handbook of creativity* (pp. 169-186). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Fiedler, F. E. (1963). *A Theory of Leadership Effective*. New York: McCrae-Hill.

Fleishman, E., & Harris, E. F. (1962). Patterns of Leadership Behaviour related to Employee Grievances and Turnover. *Personnel Psychology*, 15, 43-56

Florey, J. E., & Dorf, J. H. (1986). *Leadership skills for gifted middle school students in a rural environment*. Minden, NV: Douglas County School District. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED273404).

Ford, D. Y. (1996). *Reversing underachievement among gifted black students: Promising practices and programs*. New York: Teachers College Press.

Foster, W. H., & Silverman, L. K. (1988). Leadership curriculum for the gifted. In J. VanTassel-Baska, J. Feldhusen, K. Seeley, G. Weatley, L. K. Silverman & W. Foster (Eds.), *Comprehensive curriculum for gifted learners* (pp. 356-360). Boston, MA: Allyn & Bacon.

Freeman, J. (1979). *Gifted children*. Lancaster, UK: MTP Press.

Freeman, J. (1991). *Gifted children growing up*. London: Cassell.

Freeman, J. (1998). *Educating the very able: Current International Research (OFSTED reviews of research)*. London: The Stationery Office.

Freeman, J. (2000). Families, the essential context for gifts and talents. In K. A. Heller, F. J. Mönks, R. J. Sternberg & R. F. Subotnik (Eds.), *International handbook of giftedness and talent* (2nd ed., pp. 573-585). Oxford: Elsevier.

Freeman, J. (2003, 7 April). *Gifted children*. Lecture delivered at the University of Durham, UK.

Freeman, J. (2004). Out-of-school Educational Provision for the Gifted and Talented Around the World. *Journal of Gifted and Talented Education*, 14(3), 41-52.

Freeman, J. (Ed.). (1985). *The psychology of gifted children: Perspectives on development and education*. Suffolk: John Wiley & Sons.

Frick, D. M., & Spears, L. C. (1996). *On becoming a servant leader: The private writings of Robert K. Greenleaf*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Gage, N. L., & Berliner, D. C. (1988). *Educational psychology*. Boston, MA: Houghton Mifflin.

- Gallagher, J. J. (1966). *Research summary on gifted child education*. Springfield, IL: Office of the Illinois Superintendent of Public Instruction.
- Gallagher, J. J. (1985). *Teaching the gifted child* (3rd ed.). Boston, MA: Allyn & Bacon.
- Gallagher, J. J. (1990). *Leadership unit: The use of teacher-scholar teams to develop units for the gifted*. Australia: Hawker Brownlow Education.
- Gallagher, J. J. (2002). *Society's role in educating gifted students: The role of public policy*. Senior Scholars Series. Storrs, CT: National Research Center on the Gifted and Talented, University of Connecticut. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED476370)
- Gallagher, J. J., Weiss, P., Oglesby, K., & Thomas, T. (1983). *The status of gifted/talented education: United States surveys of needs, practices, and policies*. Ventura County, CA: Ventura County Superintendent of Schools Office.
- Galton, F. (1869). *Hereditary genius: An inquiry into its laws and consequences*. London: Macmillan.
- Gardner, H. (1983). *Frames of mind: The theory of multiple intelligences*. New York: Basic.
- Gardner, H. (1990). *To open minds*. New York: Basic Books.
- Gardner, H. (1993). *Multiple intelligences: The theory in practice*. New York: Basic.
- Gardner, H. (1995) *Leading minds*. New York: Basic Books.
- Geertz, C. (1975) *The Interpretation of Cultures*. New York: Basic Books.
- George, D. R. (1992). *The challenge of the able child*. London: David Fulton.
- George, D. R. (1995). *Gifted education: Identification and provision*. London: David Fulton.
- George, D. R. (2000). *The challenge of the able child* (2nd ed.). London: David Fulton.
- Gillman, J., & Hansen, H. (1987). Gifted Education in Minnesota Kindergartens. *Roeper Review*, 9(4), 212-214.
- Go, J. H. (2003, 6 April). Committee Chairman of Education in Jun Nam Do. *Mu Dung Newspaper*. Retrieved 6 April, 2003, from <http://kr.dailynews.yahoo.com/headlines> (in Korean).
- Greenleaf, R. K. (1998). *The power of servant leadership: Essays* (L. C. Spears, Ed.). San Francisco, CA: Berrett-Koehler.
- Gross, M. U. M. (1993). *Exceptionally gifted children*. London: Routledge.
- Gross, M. U. M. (1998). Issues in assessing the highly gifted. *Understanding Our Gifted*, pp. 3-8.
- Gross, M. U. M. (2002). Social and emotional issues for exceptionally intellectually gifted students. In M. Neihart, S. M. Reis, N. M. Robinson & S. M. Moon (Eds.), *The social and emotional development of gifted children: What do we know?* (pp. 19-29). Waco, TX: Prufrock Press.

Guba, E. G., & Lincoln, Y. S. (1994). Competing paradigms in qualitative research. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *Handbook of Qualitative Research* (pp. 105-117). Thousand Oaks: Sage.

Guon, Y. J. (2003). A Research on Traditional Personality Education Model Centred on Pedagogy. *Diverse Approaches to Personality Development* (pp. 15-36). Seoul: Korean Personality Education Association (in Korean).

Gurney, P. (1998). *Self-esteem in children with special educational needs*. London: Routledge.

Gyeonggi Province Education Research Institute. (1995). *Education of self understanding*. Suwon: Sechang Press (in Korean).

Hall, S. (2000). *Using picture storybooks to teach character education*. Phoenix, AZ: Oryx press.

Hallahan, D. P., & Kauffman, J. M. (1994). *Exceptional children: Introduction to special education* (6th ed.). Boston, MA: Allyn & Bacon.

Han, K. S. (2006). Current Status and Future Prospect of Gifted Education Programs. *The Journal of the Korean Society for the Gifted and Talented*, 5(1), 110-111.

Han, S. S. (2005). *A basic study of the psychological characteristics and development of language-creative gifted students*. Seoul: Korean Educational Development Institute Press (in Korean).

Hasenfeld, Y. (1983). *Human service organizations*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Hensel, N. H. (1991). Social Leadership Skills in Young Children. *Roeper Review*, 14(1), 4-6.

Hergenhahn, B. R. (1982). *An introduction to theories of learning*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Hoge, J. D. (1996). *Effective elementary social studies*. Belmont: Wadsworth.

Hollingworth, L. S. (1926). *Gifted children: Their nature and nurture*. New York: Macmillan.

Hook, P., & Vass, A. (2000). *Confident classroom leadership*. London: David Fulton.

Howe, M. J. A. (1997). *IQ in question: The truth about intelligence*. London: Sage.

Howe, M. J. A. (1999). *The psychology of high abilities*. London: Macmillan.

Howe, M. J. A., Davidson, J. W., & Sloboda, J. A. (1998). Innate Talents: Reality or Myth? *Behavioral and Brain Sciences*, 21(3), 399-442.

Howley, A., Howley, C. B., & Pendarvis, E. D. (1986). *Teaching gifted children*. Boston, MA: Little, Brown.

Huh, N. Y. (2005). Developing a programme from the Triad model. *Gifted Education Programme Development and Guidance* (pp. 77-85). Seoul: Korean Education Development Institute Press (in Korean).

Humphries, B. (1994). Empowerment and Social Research: Elements for an Analytic Framework. In B. Humphries & C. Truman (Eds.), *Rethinking Social Research*. Aldershot: Avebury

Hymer, B. J. (2003). Included Not Isolated: Meeting the Needs of Gifted and Talented Learners in Mainstream Schools. *Curriculum Briefing*, 1(2), 31-34.

Incumbent Judge's Seoul University-Harvard University Musings: "Hard Workers are Overrated...Ordinary Values are Important." (2007, 13 February). *Chosun News*. Retrieved 13 February, 2007, from news.chosun.com (in Korean).

International Institute of the Gifted (2003). The identification of gifted students. Available: http://www.wewillb.com/introduce/intro03_3.asp [1 October 2006].

Jago, A. G. (1982). Leadership: Perspectives in Theory and Research. *Management Science*, 28(3), 315-336.

Jin, S. U. (2003). *Giftedness and leadership*. Seoul: Education Science Company (in Korean).

Jin, S. U. (2005). Gifted Teaching and Learning. In *Gifted education for the formation of creative knowledge producers* (pp. 116-128). Seoul: Korean Education Development Institute Press (in Korean).

Jin, S. U., & Cha, J. H. (2004). The Level of Leadership Skills for the Gifted Secondary Students of Our Country in Light of American Standards. *Korean Journal of Comparative Education*, 14(3), 122 (in Korean).

Jin, S. U., Park, S. I. et al. (2003). *Gifted Education*. Seoul: Gyoyoukguahaksa (in Korean).

Joyce, B. R., Weil, M., & Showers, B. (1992). *Models of teaching* (4th ed.). Boston, MA: Allyn & Bacon.

Jun, K. W. (2000). *Korean gifted/talented/creative education for the new millennium*. Seoul: Hak Moon Sa.

Jun, S. M. (2004). *Group Counselling Programme for Students*. Seoul: Hak Ji Sa (in Korean).

Kahney, H. (1986). *Problem solving: A cognitive approach*. Milton Keynes, PA: Open University Press.

Karnes F. A. & Bean S. M. (Eds.). (2001). *Methods & materials for teaching the gifted and talented*. Waco, TX: Prufrock Press.

Karnes, F. A., & Bean, S. M. (1990). *Developing leadership in gifted youth*. ERIC Digest E485. Reston, VA: Council for Exceptional Children, ERIC Clearinghouse on Handicapped and Gifted Children. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED321490) Retrieved 14 September, 2006, from ERIC database:

Katz, R. L. (1955). Skills of an Effective Administrator. *Harvard Business Review*, 33(1), 33-42.

Kay, A. W. (1968). *Moral development*. London: Allen & Unwin.

- Keats, D. M. (1997). *Culture and the child: A guide for professionals in childcare and development*. West Sussex: John & Sons.
- Kener, Y. (1993). *Realistic and ideal self-concept of gifted children*. Unpublished master's dissertation, Tel Aviv University, Israel (in Hebrew).
- Kim, C. H. (1998). *How can you find gifted students?* Seoul: Wonmisa (in Korean).
- Kim, D. J. (2003) Korean Education. *Myung Ji University Journal*. 39. (in Korean).
- Kim, G. G. (2005, April). *Leadership through culture*. Retrieved 14 September, 2006, from www.duranno.com/moksiin/detail.asp?CTS_ID=29334 (in Korean).
- Kim, H. T. (1997). Personality Education Programme for Secondary Schools. *The 27th Thesis of the University of Hannam* (pp. 196-199). Hannam: University of Hannam (in Korean).
- Kim, H. W. (2003). *Direction of the development of gifted education*. Je Ju Do: Je Ju Do Education Department (in Korean).
- Kim, H. W., Yoon, C. H., Yoon, Y. H., & Kim, H. C. (2003). *The study on gifted elementary school children's cognitive and affective characteristics and guiding strategies*. Seoul: Korean Educational Development Institute Press (in Korean).
- Kim, J. H. (1998). *Manual of Judgment of Gifted Students*. Seoul: Wonmisa (in Korean).
- Kim, K. H. (2005). Learning from each other: Creativity in East Asian and American Education. *Creative Research Journal*, 17(3), 49-54.
- Kim, M. J. (2001). *Research on the analysis of the curriculum of science gifted education*. Unpublished master's thesis, Incheon University, South Korea (in Korean).
- Kim, M. S. (2004). Pastoral Leadership as a Servant: Servant Leadership and its Effect on Management Church Organization. *The Journal of Business Administration Management Research Centre College of Business Administration Ewha Woman's University*, 4(1), page unknown.
- Kim, M. S., Cho, S. H., Yoon, C. H., & Jin, S. U. (2004). *Cognitive and affective characteristics of, and teaching strategies for, the Korean junior high school gifted students*. Seoul: Korean Educational Development Institute Press (in Korean).
- Kim, M. S., Jun, M. R., & Kim, H. J. (2005). *Social expectations on the leadership of the gifted and its constituent factors*. Seoul: Korean Education Development Institute Press (in Korean).
- Kim, O. H. & Choi, I. S. (2005). *Teacher Leadership*. Gyonggi Province: Korean Academic Information (in Korean).
- Kim, Y. E. (2000). *The effect of self-development programmes on human relationships and self-esteem*. Unpublished master's thesis, Kun Kook University, South Korea (in Korean).
- Kim, Y. H. & Kim, H. S. (2000). *A Comparative Study of Man and Woman Managers in the Companies*. Seoul: Woman Development Institute (in Korean).
- Kim, Y. J., et al. (2004). *Theory and Practice of Leadership*. Seoul: Hak Ji Sa (in Korean).

- Kohlberg, L. (1981). *Essays on moral development: The philosophy of moral development*. New York: Harper & Row.
- Korean Educational Development Institute (2001). *Gifted education total development plan*. Seoul: Shin Sung (in Korean).
- Korean Educational Development Institute (2007). *Vision, the Train that Runs on Dreams!* Seoul: Kyung Sung (in Korean).
- Korean Feminist Development Institute. (1992). *Women and leadership*. Seoul: Han Hak Sa (in Korean).
- Lamb, R. A., & Busse, C. A. (1983). Leadership Beyond Lip Service. *Roeper Review*, 5(3), 21-23.
- Lamme, L. L., Krogh, S. L., & Yachmetz, K. A. (1992). *Literature-based moral education: children's books and activities for teaching values, responsibility, and good judgment in the elementary school*. Phoenix, AZ: Oryx Press.
- Laney, M. O. (2002) *The introvert advantage: How to thrive in an extrovert world*. New York: Workman.
- Leach, E. (1982) *Social anthropology*. Glasgow: Fontana Paperbacks.
- Lee, D. H. (1998). *50 years of education*. Seoul: Chung Oon (in Korean).
- Lee, H. D. (1988). *Practice of the group counselling*. Seoul: Central Aptitude (in Korean).
- Lee, H. G. (2005). *Understanding of Gifted Education Policy*. Seoul: Ministry of Education and Human Resources (in Korean).
- Lee, H. M. (2002). Gifted Education Curriculum Development and Themes. *The Gifted and Gifted Education*, 1(1), 91-124 (in Korean).
- Lee, I. S., (September, 1995). Special Activities of the Art Classes in American Central Elementary School which Cultivates Artistic Talent and Leadership. *Our Education Journal*, pp. 182-186 (in Korean)
- Lee, J. D., et al. (1997). *Children's Moral Education through Books*. Seoul: Next Generation (in Korean).
- Lee, J. G. (2002). A study of an education programme of personality development. Unpublished master's thesis, Gong Ju University, South Korea (in Korean).
- Lee, J. G. (2005). *Gifted education for the training of creative knowledge producers*. Seoul: Korean Education Development Institute Press (in Korean).
- Lee, J. K. (2005). Asiatic values in East Asian higher education: From a standpoint of globalization. *Globalization*, 5(1), 1-19.
- Lee, J. S. (1996). Gifted Education: Judgment and Reality of Education. *Gifted Education Research of Society of Gifted Education*, 6(1), 107-124 (in Korean).

- Lee, S. H. (2004). Positive Study on the Effectiveness of Servant Leadership. *The 30th Collection of Thesis of Suwon Women's College* (unknown page). Suwon: Suwon Women's College (in Korean).
- Lim, S. H. (1995). *Invitation to creativity*. Seoul: Gyo Bo Mun Go (in Korean).
- Lindsay, B. A. (1988). Lamp for Diogenes: Leadership, Giftedness, and Moral Education. *Roeper Review*, 11(1), 8-11.
- Lipman, M. (1994). Do Elementary School Children Need Philosophy? *The Finnish Journal of Education*, 3, 281-286.
- Lippmann, W. (1922). *Public opinion*. New York: The Free Press.
- Little, C. (2001). A Closer Look at Gifted Children with Disabilities. *Gifted Child Today (GCT)*, 24(3), 46-53.
- Loden, M. (1985). *Feminine leadership, or how to succeed in business without being one of the boys*. New York: Times Books.
- Lord, E., & Bailey, C. (1973). *A reader in religious and moral education*. London: S.C.M. Press.
- Maccoby, E. E., & Jacklin, C. N. (1974). *The psychology of sex differences*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Macy, C. (1969). *Let's teach them right: Perspectives on religious and moral education*. London: Pemberton Books.
- Magoon, T. M. (1980). The Eye of a Beholder. *Counselling Psychology*, 8(4), 26-28.
- Maker, C. J. (1982). *Curriculum development for the gifted*. Rockville, MD: Aspen.
- Maker, C. J., & Nielson, A. B. (1995). *Teaching/learning models in education of the gifted*. Austin, TX: Pro-Ed.
- 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, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.
- Marshall. C. & Rossman, G. (1995). *Designing qualitative research* (2nd edition). Newbury Park: Sage.
- Mautner, T. [Ed.]. (2000). *The penguin dictionary of philosophy* (4th ed.). London: Penguin Books.
- May, P. R. (1971). *Moral education in school*. London: Methuen Educational.
- McCulloch, R., & Mathieson, M. (1995). *Moral education through English 11-16*. London: David Fulton.
- McGrath, J., & McGrath, A. (2002). *Self-esteem*. Wheaton, IL: Crossway Books.
- McKinsey Incorporated (Ed.). (2001). *Woman Korea report*. Seoul: Daily Economic Press.

- McLeod, J., & Cropley, A. (1989). *Fostering academic excellence*. New York: Pergamon Press.
- Mertens, D. M. (2005). *Research methods in education and psychology: Integrating diversity with quantitative and qualitative approaches* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks: Sage.
- Miller, P. H. (1989). *Theories of developmental psychology* (2nd ed.). New York: W. H. Freeman.
- Ministry of Education and Human Resources Development. (1993). *Interpretation of primary school education curriculum*. Seoul: Korean Textbooks Publishers (in Korean).
- Ministry of Education and Human Resources Development. (2006). *Education in Korea 2005-2006*. Seoul: National Institute for International Education Development (in Korean).
- Monson, J. A. (1984). An advocates' guide to advocating... or a good offense without being offensive. *Journal for the Education of the Gifted*, 7, 244-251.
- Montgomery, D. (1996). *Educating the able*. London: Cassell.
- Montgomery, D. (2001). Teaching the More Able: An Update. *Gifted Education International*, 15(3), 262-280
- Moon, S. M., & Rosselli, H. (2000). Developing gifted programs. In K. A. Heller, F. J. Mönks, R. J. Sternberg, & R. Subotnik (Eds.), *International handbook for research on giftedness and talent* (2nd ed., pp. 499-521). Oxford, England: Pergamon Press.
- Moorcroft, C. (1999). *Personal and social education*. London: A&C Black.
- Moral Education. (n.d.). *Yahoo! Korea Encyclopaedia Dictionary*. Retrieved 14 September, 2006, from Yahoo! Korea Encyclopaedia Dictionary Online Database.
- Mueller, C. M., & Dweck, C. S. (1998). Intelligence Praise Can Undermine Motivation and Performance. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 75(11), 33-52.
- Mun, Y. L. (2003). *A Manual Guide to Success Intelligence Test*. Seoul: Daegyo Evaluation Centre of Korean Education (in Korean).
- Naisbitt, J. (1999). *Megachallenges: A compass for the 21st century*. Toyko: Tachibana Shuppan.
- Nam, K. D (2003). Developmental Direction of Personality Education in Military Academies. *Symposium for Advanced Education and Gifted Education Policies* (pp. 108-109). Seoul: Korean Educational Development Institute Press (in Korean).
- National Institute for International Education Development (NIIED). (2005). *Ministry of education and human resources development*. Seoul: NIIED (in Korean).
- Ng, A. K. (2003). A Cultural Model of Creative and Conforming Behaviour. *Creativity Research Journal*, 15(2&3), 223-233.
- Northouse, P. G. (2004). *Leadership Theory and Practice* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage

- Olenchak F. R., & Renzulli J. S. (1989). The Effectiveness of the Schoolwide Enrichment Model on Selected Aspects of Elementary School Change. *Gifted Child Quarterly*, 33(1), 36-46.
- Oppenheim, A. N. (1992). *Questionnaire design, interviewing and attitude measurement*. London: Pinter.
- Osborn, A. F. (1963). *Applied imagination: Principles and procedures of creative thinking* (2nd ed.). New York: Scribener's.
- Park, B., & Chu, B. (1996). *Ethics and moral education*. Seoul: Ingan Sarang (in Korean).
- Park, C. S. (2006). The Relationship, Acceleration, Intelligence Theory for Gifted Programs. *The Journal of the Korean Society for the Gifted and Talented*, 5(1), 25-44 (in Korean).
- Park, E. J. (2005). Let's Teach Easy American English III in Comparison to American Gifted Education. *International Local Information of Foreignlogy Comprehensive Research Centre of the Hankuk University of Foreign Studies*, 9(4), 21-51 (in Korean).
- Park, E. J. (2007, 27 June). *Development of latent leadership in American gifted students*. Retrieved 27 June, 2007, from <http://uclass.in/224> (in Korean).
- Park, E. Y. (2000). A Systemic Model for Gifted Education. *Journal of Gifted/Talented Education*, 10(2), 1-23 (in Korean).
- Park, S. I. & Cho, S. H. (1996). *Teaching Method of the Science Gifted*. Seoul: Korean Science Institute Press (in Korean).
- Park, S. Y. (2002). *Research in human development and leadership cultivation through leadership training*. Seoul: Korean Education Development Institute Press (in Korean).
- Parker, J. P. (1983). The Leadership Training Model. *Gifted Child Today (GCT)*, 29, 8-13.
- Parker, J. P., & Begnaud, L. G. (2004). *Developing creative leadership*. Portsmouth, NH: Teacher Ideas Press.
- Parnes, S. J. (1971). Can creativity be increased? In G. A. Davis & J.A. Scott (Eds.), *Training creative thinking* (pp. 270-275). Huntington, NY: Krieger.
- Passow, A. H. (1985). Intellectual development of the gifted. In F. R. Link (Ed.), *Essays on the intellect* (pp. 23-43). Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- Passow, A. H. (1988). Styles of Leadership Training...and Some More Thoughts. *Gifted Child Today (GCT)*, 11(6), 34-38
- Passow, A. H., & Schiff, J. H. (1989). Educating Gifted Persons Who Are Caring and Concerned. *Gifted Education International*, 6(1), 5-7.
- Patton, M. Q. (1984). *Qualitative evaluation methods*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Peck, R. F., & Havighurst, R. J. (1960). *The psychology of character development*. New York: John Wiley & Sons.

- Pfeiffer, S. I. (2001). Professional Psychology and the Gifted: Emerging Practice Opportunities. *Professional Psychology: Research and Practice*, 32(2), 175-180.
- Piaget, J. (1975). *The origin of the idea of chance in children*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.
- Piechowski, M. M. (1986). The Concept of Developmental Potential. *Roeper Review*, 8(3), 190-197.
- Piechowski, M. M. (1991). Emotional development and emotional giftedness. In N. Colangelo & G. A. Davis (Eds.), *A handbook of gifted education* (pp. 285-306). Needham Heights, MA: Allyn & Bacon.
- Pincoffs, E. L. (1986). *Quandaries and virtues: Against relativism in ethics*. Lawrence: University Kansas Press.
- Plowman, P. D. (1981). Training Extraordinary Leaders. *Roeper Review*, 3(3), 13-16.
- Plucker, J. A., Callahan, C. M., & Tomchin, E. M. (1996). Wherefore Art Thou, Multiple Intelligences? Alternative Assessments for Identifying Talent in Ethnically Diverse and Low Income Students. *Gifted Child Quarterly*, 40(2), 81-92.
- Plummer, D. M. (2001). *Helping children to build self-esteem*. London: Jessica Kingsley.
- Pocklington, K., Fletcher-Campbell, F. & Kendall, L. (2002). The Gifted and Talented strand of EIC: The pupils' voice (Excellence in Cities Report 04-1/2002) [Online]. Available:
- Porter, L. (1999). *Gifted young children*. Buckingham: Open University Press.
- Pring, R. (1984). *Personal and social education in the curriculum*. Kent: Hodder & Stroughton Educational.
- Pye, L. W., & Pye, M. W. (1985). *Asian power and politics: The cultural dimensions of authority*. Cambridge: The Bellnap Press of Harvard University Press.
- Rao, A., & Kelleher, D. (2000). Leadership for Social Transformation: Some Ideas and Questions on Institutions and Feminist Leadership. *Gender and Development*, 8(3), 74-79.
- Rash, P. K., & Miller, A. D. (2000). A Survey of Practice of Teachers of the Gifted. *Roeper Review*, 22(3), 192-194.
- Rath, L. E., Hamin, M., & Simon, S. B. (1994). Value and Teaching. (S. S. Chung & S. M. Cho, Trans.). Seoul: Chul Hak Gwa Hyon Press (in Korean). (Original work published 1978).
- Reber, A. S., & Reber, E. (2002). *The penguin dictionary of psychology* (3rd ed.). Oxford: Penguin.
- Reid, C., & Romanoff, B. (1997). Using Multiple Intelligence Theory to Identify Gifted Children. *Educational Leadership*, 55(1), 71-74.
- Reis, S. M., & Burns, D. E. (1987). A Schoolwide Enrichment Team Invites You to Read About Methods for Promoting Community and Faculty Involvement in a Gifted Education Program. *Gifted Child Today (GCT)*, 49(2), 27-32.

Reis, S. M., & Renzulli, J. S. (1982). A Research Report on the Revolving Door Identification Model: A Case for the Broadened Conception of Giftedness. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 63(9), 619-620.

Reis, S. M., Westberg, K. L., Kulikowich, J., Caillard, F., Hébert, T. P., Purcell, J. H., et al. (1992, April). Modifying regular classroom instruction with curriculum compacting. In J. S. Renzulli (Chair), *Regular classroom practices with gifted students: Findings from the National Research Center on the Gifted and Talented*. Symposium conducted at the meeting of the American Educational Research Association, San Francisco, CA.

Renzulli, J. S. (1977). *The enrichment triad model: A guide for developing defensible programs for the gifted and talented*. Mansfield Center, CT: Creative Learning Press.

Renzulli, J. S. (1978). What Makes Giftedness? Re-examining a Definition. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 60(3), 180-184.

Renzulli, J. S. (1986). *System and models for developing programs for the gifted and talented*. Mansfield Center, CT: Creative Learning Press.

Renzulli, J. S. (1995). *Building a bridge between gifted education and total school improvement: Talent development research-based decision making series 9502*. Storrs, CT: The University of Connecticut, National Research Centre on the Gifted and Talented.

Renzulli, J. S. (1996). *How to develop an authentic enrichment cluster*. Storrs, CT: The University of Connecticut, National Research Centre on the Gifted and Talented.

Renzulli, J. S. (1998). The three-ring conception of giftedness. In S. M. Baum, S. M. Reis & L. R. Maxfield (Eds.), *Nurturing the gifts and talents of primary grade students* (pp. 1-27). Mansfield Center, CT: Creative Learning Press.

Renzulli, J. S. (1999). What is this Thing Called Giftedness, and How Do We Develop It? A Twenty-five Year Perspective. *Journal for the Education of the Gifted*, 23(1), 3-54.

Renzulli, J. S. (2000). One Way to Organize Exploratory Curriculum: Academies of Inquiry and Talent Development (Part 1). *Middle School Journal*, 32(1), 5-14.

Renzulli, J. S., Smith, L., White, A., Callahan, C., & Hartman, R. (1976). *Scales for rating the behavioral characteristics of superior students*. Mansfield Center, CT: Creative Learning Press.

Richardson, W. B., & Feldhusen, J. F. (1986). *Leadership education: Developing skills for youth* (2nd ed.). New York: Trillium Press.

Richardson, W. B., & Feldhusen, J. F. (1990). *Leadership education: Developing skills for youth* (3rd ed.). Australia: Hawker Brownlow Education.

Robbins, S. P. (1996). *Organizational behavior: Concepts, controversies, applications* (7th ed.). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Roberts, R. (2002). *Self-esteem and early learning*. London: Sage.

Rodd, J. (1994). *Leadership in early childhood: The pathway to professionalism*. Buckingham: Open University Press.

- Rodd, J. (1998). *Leadership in early childhood: The pathway to professionalism* (2nd ed.). Buckingham: Open University Press.
- Rogers, K. B. (1990, November). *Using effect size to make good decisions about acceleration*. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the National Association for Gifted Children, Little Rock, AR.
- Rosener, J. B. (1990). Ways Women Lead. *Harvard Business Review*, 68(6), 119-125.
- Rosener, J. B. (1995). *America's competitive secret: Utilizing women as a management strategy*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Rost, J. C. (1993). *Leadership for the twenty-first century*. Westport, CT: Greenwood.
- Rost, J. C. (1999). *Leadership for the twenty-first century*. Westport, CT: Praeger.
- Rue, J. Y. (2004). Application of Multiplex Intelligence Theory into Gifted Education. *Journal of Education Curriculum*, 22(1), 1-15 (in Korean).
- Runco, M. A., & Johnson, D. J. (2002). Parents' and Teachers' Implicit Theories of Children's Creativity: A Cross-cultural Perspective. *Creativity Research Journal*, 14(3-4), 427-438.
- Rustin, M. (1997). Innate morality: A psychoanalytic approach to moral education. In R. Smith & P. Standish (Eds.), *Teaching right and wrong* (pp. 75-92). London: Trentham Books.
- Saimdang Institute. (2000). *Saimdang Education*. Gang Rung, South Korea: Samsung Publishing Company (in Korean).
- Sanborn, M. P. (1977). A statewide program in the discovery and guidance of gifted students. In J. C. Stanley (Ed.), *Educational programs and intellectual prodigies* (page unknown). Baltimore, Maryland: The John Hopkins University Press.
- Schaeffer, E. F. (1999, 14 June). Teaching about character [Letter to the editor]. *Time*, 153(23), 21.
- Schiever, S. W., & Maker, C. J. (2003). New directions in enrichment and acceleration. In N. Colangelo & G. A. Davis (Eds.), *Handbook of gifted education* (3rd ed., pp. 163-173). Boston, MA: Allyn & Bacon.
- Sekowski, A. (1995). Self-esteem and Achievements of Gifted Students. *Gifted Education International*, 10(2), 65-70
- Shin, E. S., et al., (2004). *Theory and Practice of Leadership*. Seoul: Hakjisa (in Korean).
- Shin, G. B. (2001). A study of Korean leadership conception. *Korean Society of Management Journal*, 12, 89-117.
- Shore, B. M., Cornell, D. G., Robinson, A., & Ward, V. S. (1991). *Recommended practices in gifted education*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Silverman, L. K. (1993). Social development, leadership and gender issues. In L. K. Silverman (Ed.) *Counseling the Gifted and Talented*. (pp. 291-327) Denver, CO: Love.
- Silverman, L. K. (1994). The Moral Sensitivity of Gifted Children and the Evolution of Society. *Roeper Review*, 17(2), 110-116.

- Silverman, L. K. (n.d.). *Problems in the Assessment of Gifted Children*. Retrieved 14 September, 2006, from http://www.gifteddevelopment.com/PDF_files/problems.pdf
- Sin, G. B. (2001). A Study on the Korean Leadership Concept. *Journal of Korean Economics Society*, 30, 89-117 (in Korean).
- Sisa Yong-o-sa [Ed.]. (1982). *New world concise Korean-English dictionary*. Seoul: Sisa Yong-o-sa Publishers.
- Sisk, D. A. (1982). Caring and Sharing: Moral Development of Gifted Students. *Elementary School Journal*, 82(3), 221-229.
- Sisk, D. A. (1985). Leadership Development: Its Importance in Programs For Gifted Youth. *NASSP Bulletin*, 69(482), 48-54.
- Smith, F. (n.d.). *The Advantages of Using the Stanford-Binet Version 5 when Assessing Gifted Individuals*. Retrieved 20 November, 2005, from
- Smith, R. B. (2006, October). *The experience of the National Academy for Gifted and Talented Youth (NAGTY) U.K.: Development of policy and practice in schools in England. The English model*. Paper presented at the International Symposium of Gifted Education, South Korea.
- Smutny, J. F., Veenker, K., & Veenker, S. (1989). *Your gifted child: How to recognize and develop the special talents in your child from birth to age seven*. New York: Facts on File.
- Son, B. H. (1995). Personality Education: Its Need, Character, and Methodology. *Journal of Philosophy and Reality*, Winter, page unknown (in Korean).
- Son, T. Y. (2006, 9 May). Problem Solving Ability. *Sarang Bang*. Retrieved 9 May, 2006 from www.sarangbang.com (in Korean).
- Stankowski, W. M. (1978). Definition. In R. E. Clasen & B. Robinson (Eds.), *Simple gifts: The education of the gifted, talented, and creative* (page unknown). Madison, WI: University of Wisconsin-Extension.
- Stanley, J. (1978). Identifying and nurturing the intellectually gifted. In R. E. Clasen & B. Robinson (Eds.), *Simple gifts*. Madison, WI: University of Wisconsin.
- Starratt, R. J. (1994). *Building an ethical school: A practical response to the moral crisis in schools*. London: Falmer Press.
- Sternberg, R. J., & Grigorenko, E. L. (2004). Intelligence and Culture: How Culture Shapes What Intelligence Means, and the Implications for a Science of Well-being. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society London, Series B*, 359(1449), 1427-1434.
- Sternberg, R. J. (1985). *Beyond I.Q.: A Triarchic Theory of Human Intelligence*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Sternberg, R. J., & Davidson, J. E. (1983). Insight in the Gifted. *Educational Psychologist*, 18, 51-57.
- Sternberg, R. J., & Davidson, J. E. (1986). *Conceptions of giftedness*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- Sternberg, R. J., & Grigorenko, E. L. (2004). Successful Intelligence in the Classroom. *Theory into Practice*, 43(4), 274-280.
- Sternberg, R.J. (1977). *Intelligence, Information Processing, and Analogical Reasoning*. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Stogdill, R. M. (1948). Personal Factors Associated with Leadership: A Survey of the Literature. *Journal of Psychology*, 25, 35-71.
- Stremikis, B. A. (2002). The Personal Characteristics and Environmental Circumstances of Successful Women Musicians. *Creativity Research Journal*, 14(1), 85-92.
- Struck, J. M. (2003). Incorporating higher order process skills into content. In J. VanTassel-Baska & A. L. Catherine (Eds.), *Content-based curriculum for high-ability learners* (pp. 47-48). Waco, TX: Prufrock Press.
- Sue, S. & Okazaki, S. (1990) Asian-American educational achievements: A phenomenon in search of an explanation. *American Psychologist*, 45(8), 913-920.
- Suh, H. E., Son, Y. A., & Kim, G. J. (2003). *Current status of teaching and learning at educational institutions for the gifted*. Seoul: Korean Educational Development Institute Press (in Korean).
- Suh, S. H. (2006, 22 May). *The Importance of Character Education for Children*. Retrieved 14 September, 2006, from <http://kr.blog.yahoo.com/saminforest/1096.html> (in Korean).
- Sung, E. H. (2006). Creativity in the East and the West. *The Journal of the Korean Society for the Gifted and Talented*, 5(1), 45-62. (in Korean).
- Super, C. (1976). Environmental Effects on Motor Development: The Case of 'African Infant Precocity.' *Developmental Medicine and Child Neurology*, 18(5), 561-7.
- Sutcliffe, J. Danger: Schools on brink of overheating. *Times Educational Supplement*. Retrieved 12 September, 1997.
- Tannenbaum, A. J. (1983). *Gifted children: Psychological and educational perspectives*. New York: Macmillan.
- Terman, L. M. (1918). The Vocabulary Test as a Measure of Intelligence. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 9, 452-459.
- Terman, L. M. (1925). *Genetic studies of genius* (Vols. 1-5). Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Terman, L. M. (1947). *The gifted child grows up, twenty-five years follow up of a superior group: Genetic studies of genius* (Vol. 4). Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
- The Moral Immunity Our Society's Governing Class. (2005, 7 August). *Incheon Christian Newspaper*. Retrieved 7 August, 2005, from www.iccnews.co.kr (in Korean).
- The U.K. Cannot Be Second Best. (2007, 22 June). *Chosun News*. Retrieved 22 June, 2007, from news.chosun.com (in Korean).

- Thomas, R. M., & Brubaker, D. L. (2000). *Theses and dissertations: A guide to planning, research and writing*. London: Bergin & Garvey.
- Thomson, M. (2006). *Supporting gifted and talented pupils in the secondary school*. London: Paul Chapman.
- Thorndike E. L. (1927). The law of effect. *The American Journal of Psychology*, 39(1), 212-222.
- Torrance, E. P. (1984). Teaching gifted and creative learners. In M. C. Wittrock (Ed.), *Handbook of research on teaching* (3rd ed., pp. 630-647). Chicago: Rand-McNally.
- Torrance, E. P. (1988). The nature of creativity as manifest in its testing. In R. J. Sternberg (Ed.), *The nature of creativity: Contemporary psychological perspectives* (pp. 43-75). New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Tuttle, F. B., & Becker, L. A. (1975). *Characteristics and identification of gifted and talented students*. Washington, D.C.: National Education Association.
- Tylor, E. B. (1871) *Primitive Culture*. London: John Murray.
- Uh, J. J., Kim, H. J., Kim, E. K., & Lee, H. K. (2003). *Voluntary Service Education Programme Model Development for Youth Leadership Growth: A Research Report of Korean Youth Development Institute*. Seoul: Korean Youth Development Institute (in Korean).
- United States Department of Education. *Education of the gifted and talented?* Washington, DC: Government Printing Office (USGPO), 2003.
- United States Department of Education. *National excellence: A case for developing America's talent*. Washington, DC: Government Printing Office (USGPO), 1993.
- Urban, K. K., & Jellen, H. G. (1988). Assessing Creative Potential World-wide: The First Cross-cultural Application of the TCT-DT. *Creative Child and Adult Quarterly*, 14,151-167.
- Valdes, G. (2003). *Expanding definitions of giftedness*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- VanTassel-Baska, J. (1981). A comprehensive model of career education for gifted and talented. *Journal of Career Education*, 325-331.
- VanTassel-Baska, J. (1981, December). *The great debates: For acceleration*. CEC/TAG National Topical Conference on the Gifted and Talented Child, Orlando, FL.
- VanTassel-Baska, J. (1986). Effective curriculum and instructional models for talented students. *Gifted Child Quarterly*, 30, 164-169.
- VanTassel-Baska, J. (1992). *Planning effective curriculum for the gifted*. Denver, CO: Love.
- VanTassel-Baska, J., & Brown, E. F. (2004). An analysis of gifted education curricular models. In F. A. Karnes & S. M. Bean (Eds.), *Methods & materials for gifted learners* (2nd ed., pp. 75-101). Waco, TX: Prufrock Press.
- Varner, A. F. (1983). Risk Taker, Caretaker or Undertaker: Which Are You? *Child Care Information Exchange*, pp. 1-3.

- Verma, G. K., & Mallick, K. (1999). *Researching education: Perspectives and techniques*. London: Falmer Press.
- Vernon ,P., Adams, G., & Vernon, D. F., (1977). *The psychology and education of gifted children*. London : Methuen
- Vroom, V. H., & Yetton, P. W. (1973). *Leadership and decision-making*. Pittsburgh, PA: University of Pittsburgh Press.
- Walke, J. C., & Evers, C. W. (1999). Research in education: Epistemological issues. In J. P. Keeves & G. Lamomski (Eds.), *Issues in Education Research* (pp. 40-56). New York: Pergamon.
- Walker, S. Y. (2002). *The survival guide for parents of gifted kids: How to understand, live with, and stick up for your child*. Minneapolis, MN: Free Spirit.
- Whalley, M. (1994). *Learning to be strong*. London: Hodder & Stoughton.
- Whitaker, M. R. P. (1997). *Primary schools and the future*. Buckingham: Open University Press.
- White, K., Fletcher-Campbell, F., & Ridley, K. (2003). *What works for gifted talented pupils: A review of recent research* (Local Government Association Research Report 51). Slough: National Foundation for Educational Research, NFER.
- Williams, R. (1965) *The Long Revolution*. Harmondsworth: Pelican.
- Willig, C. J. (1990). *Children's concepts and the primary curriculum*. London: Paul Chapman.
- Wilson, N., & McLean, S. (1994). *Questionnaire design: a practical introduction* Newtown Abbey, County Antum: University of Ulster Press.
- Winner, E. (1998). Uncommon Talents: Gifted Children, Prodigies, and Savants. *Scientific American Presents*, 9(4), 32-37.
- Wong, K. C. (2001). Culture and educational leadership. In K. C. Wong & C. W. Evers (Eds.). *Leadership for quality schooling: International perspectives* (pp. 36-53). London: Routledge Falmer.
- Woolfolk, A. E. (1995). *Educational psychology* (6th ed.). London: Allyn & Bacon.
- Wright, P. B., & Leroux, J. A. (1997). The Self-concept of Gifted Adolescents in a Congregated Program. *Gifted Child Quarterly*, 41(3), 83-94.
- Wu, D. H. (2004). *Understanding of gifted children and education*. Seoul : Hak mun sa (in Korean).
- Yalon-Chamovitz, S., & Greenspan, S. (2005). Ability to Identify, Explain and Solve Problems in Everyday Tasks: Preliminary Validation of a Direct Video Measure of Practical Intelligence. *Research in Developmental Disabilities*, 26(3), 219-230.
- Yarnell, T. D. (1999). *15 signs of high self-esteem*. Retrieved 14 September, 2006, from
- Yoon, J. I. (2002). Diagnosis and the Prospect of Present Education Situation. *Korean Educational Development Institute Journal*, Summer(10), page unknown (in Korean).

Yoon, J. I. (2002). Diagnosis and the prospect of present education situation. Seoul: Korean Educational Development Institute Press (in Korean).

Yoon, J. I., & Park, S. I. (2003). *Consolidation of educational system for the gifted in science*. Seoul: Korean Education Development Institute Press (in Korean).

Yulk, G. A. (1989). *Leadership in organizations* (2nd ed.). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

