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8.1. INTRODUCTION  
Apart from analysis of variance t-ratios were worked out to know the trend of the differences between the different groups. It is not enough to know whether the differences occur or not, it is also very important to know in what direction these differences fall in case they do exist. These differences have been found out between gifted and average, between males and females on perceived self, ideal self, the discrepancies between the two. The same was found out for the perceived and real self as well as for the discrepancies existing between the two. The t-ratios were worked out for the composite scores also in the case of perceived and ideal self only.

All the calculations were done by hand because it was not possible to make use of the computers or calculators, since such facilities are not easily available.

8.2. RESULTS  
T-ratios are presented in tables 8.1 to 8.25. The tables numbered from 6.1 to 6.47 were given in chapter six. These tables contained frequency distributions along with their means, SD's, skewness and kurtosis. Since the sample was small in most of the cases, especially where the wordwise analysis had been done on different dimensions, the small statistics had been carried out to find the t-ratios. This method has been recommended by Garrett (1961) for small samples.
### TABLE 8.1
SIGNIFICANCE OF DIFFERENCE BETWEEN MEANS OF DIFFERENT GROUPS PRESENTED IN TABLE NOS. 6.1 & 6.2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Column No.</th>
<th>SE_d</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Level of Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Perceived Gifted (M + F) Average (M + F)</td>
<td>3.91</td>
<td>1.40</td>
<td>.350</td>
<td>198</td>
<td>Not significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived Males (G + A) Females (G + A)</td>
<td>3.77</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>1.32</td>
<td>198</td>
<td>Not significant</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TABLE 8.2
SIGNIFICANCE OF DIFFERENCE BETWEEN MEANS OF DIFFERENT GROUPS PRESENTED IN TABLE NO. 6.3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Column No.</th>
<th>SE_d</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Level of significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1, 2 Perceived G, A (Males)</td>
<td>6.15</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>.580</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>Not significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3, 4 Perceived G, A (Females)</td>
<td>5.13</td>
<td>7.30</td>
<td>1.52</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>Not significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1, 3 Perceived G, G (Males &amp; Females)</td>
<td>5.21</td>
<td>6.60</td>
<td>1.26</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>Not significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2, 4 Perceived A, A (Males &amp; Females)</td>
<td>5.06</td>
<td>11.40</td>
<td>2.20</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>0.05 level</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 8.3
SIGNIFICANCE OF DIFFERENCE BETWEEN MEANS OF DIFFERENT GROUPS
PRESENTED IN TABLE NOS. 6.4 AND 6.5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Column No.</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Level of significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Positive (Perc.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gifted (M + F)</td>
<td>1.47</td>
<td>1.90</td>
<td>1.22</td>
<td>338</td>
<td>Not significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average (M + F)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative (Perc.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gifted (M + F)</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>338</td>
<td>Not significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average (M + F)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 8.4
SIGNIFICANCE OF DIFFERENCE BETWEEN MEANS OF DIFFERENT GROUPS
PRESENTED IN TABLE NOS. 6.6 AND 6.7

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Column No.</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Level of significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Positive (Perc.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Males (G + A)</td>
<td>1.41</td>
<td>5.30</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>338</td>
<td>0.01 level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Females (G + A)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative (Perc.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Males (G + A)</td>
<td>1.19</td>
<td>3.35</td>
<td>2.81</td>
<td>338</td>
<td>0.01 level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Females (G + A)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column No.</td>
<td>SE</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>df</td>
<td>Level of significance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Total Parc.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G, A (Males)</td>
<td>2.02</td>
<td>2.28</td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>Not significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Total Parc.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G, A (Females)</td>
<td>2.03</td>
<td>5.30</td>
<td>2.61</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>0.01 level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Total Parc.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G, A (Males)</td>
<td>1.81</td>
<td>2.40</td>
<td>1.32</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>Not significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Total Parc.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G, A (Females)</td>
<td>1.67</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>1.34</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>Not significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Total Parc.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G, G (Males, Females)</td>
<td>1.98</td>
<td>9.13</td>
<td>4.61</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>0.01 level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Total Parc.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A, A (Males, Females)</td>
<td>2.06</td>
<td>1.56</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>Not significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Total Parc.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G, G (Males, Females)</td>
<td>1.79</td>
<td>5.75</td>
<td>3.21</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>0.01 level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Total Parc.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A, A (Males, Females)</td>
<td>1.68</td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>Not significant</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 8.6

**Significance of Differences Between Means of Different Groups**

Presented in Table Nos. 6.10 and 6.29

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Column No.</th>
<th>SD&lt;sub&gt;Pool&lt;/sub&gt;</th>
<th>SD&lt;sub&gt;D&lt;/sub&gt;</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Level of significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1, 2 Positive G, A (Perc.)</td>
<td>6.59</td>
<td>2.77</td>
<td>6.36</td>
<td>2.29</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0.05 level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3, 4 Negative G, A (Perc.)</td>
<td>8.225</td>
<td>4.39</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>2.96</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0.02 level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1, 5 Positive G, G (Perc.Id.)</td>
<td>16.054</td>
<td>6.74</td>
<td>5.276</td>
<td>.78</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Not significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2, 6 Positive A, A (Perc.Id.)</td>
<td>12.01</td>
<td>5.16</td>
<td>11.28</td>
<td>2.18</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0.05 level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3, 7 Negative G, G (Perc.Id.)</td>
<td>6.65</td>
<td>3.55</td>
<td>4.28</td>
<td>1.21</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Not significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4, 8 Negative A, A (Perc.Id.)</td>
<td>9.28</td>
<td>4.96</td>
<td>11.6</td>
<td>2.30</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0.05 level</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 8.7

**Significance of Difference Between Means of Different Groups**

Presented in Table Nos. 6.11 and 6.30

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Column No.</th>
<th>SD&lt;sub&gt;Pool&lt;/sub&gt;</th>
<th>SD&lt;sub&gt;D&lt;/sub&gt;</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Level of significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1, 2 Positive G, A (Perc.)</td>
<td>11.92</td>
<td>4.998</td>
<td>5.10</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Not significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3, 4 Negative G, A (Perc.)</td>
<td>6.01</td>
<td>3.209</td>
<td>8.15</td>
<td>2.53</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0.05 level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1, 5 Positive G, G (Perc.Id.)</td>
<td>17.47</td>
<td>7.51</td>
<td>15.37</td>
<td>2.04</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Not significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2, 6 Positive A, A (Perc.Id.)</td>
<td>13.45</td>
<td>5.78</td>
<td>12.723</td>
<td>2.20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0.05 level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3, 7 Negative G, G (Perc.Id.)</td>
<td>15.44</td>
<td>8.24</td>
<td>17.29</td>
<td>2.09</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Not significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4, 8 Negative A, A (Perc.Id.)</td>
<td>9.808</td>
<td>5.237</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>.053</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Not significant</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 8.8

**Significance of Difference Between Means of Different Groups Presented in Table Nos. 6.12 and 6.31**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Column No.</th>
<th>SD_{Pool}</th>
<th>SE_{D}</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Level of Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1,2 Positive</td>
<td>G,A (Perc.)</td>
<td>8.16</td>
<td>5.14</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3,4 Negative</td>
<td>G,A (Perc.)</td>
<td>8.97</td>
<td>5.65</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,5 Positive</td>
<td>G,G (Perc.Id.)</td>
<td>13.17</td>
<td>8.297</td>
<td>17.80</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2,6 Positive</td>
<td>A,A (Perc.Id.)</td>
<td>8.485</td>
<td>5.34</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>1.79</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3,7 Negative</td>
<td>G,G (Perc.Id.)</td>
<td>10.11</td>
<td>6.37</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>1.79</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4,8 Negative</td>
<td>A,A (Perc.Id.)</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>8.19</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 8.9

**Significance of Difference Between Means of Different Groups Presented in Table Nos. 6.13 and 6.32**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Column No.</th>
<th>SD_{Pool}</th>
<th>SE_{D}</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Level of Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1,2 Positive</td>
<td>G,A (Perc.)</td>
<td>11.93</td>
<td>7.52</td>
<td>3.60</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3,4 Negative</td>
<td>G,A (Perc.)</td>
<td>10.01</td>
<td>6.306</td>
<td>3.20</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,5 Positive</td>
<td>G,G (Perc.Id.)</td>
<td>12.13</td>
<td>7.64</td>
<td>25.4</td>
<td>3.45</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2,6 Positive</td>
<td>A,A (Perc.Id.)</td>
<td>8.068</td>
<td>5.08</td>
<td>20.2</td>
<td>3.97</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3,7 Negative</td>
<td>G,G (Perc.Id.)</td>
<td>8.25</td>
<td>5.197</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>2.88</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4,8 Negative</td>
<td>A,A (Perc.Id.)</td>
<td>12.07</td>
<td>7.60</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 8.10

**Significance of Difference Between Means of Different Groups**

Presented in Table Nos. 6.14 and 6.33

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Column No.</th>
<th>SD_{pool}</th>
<th>( \bar{D} )</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Level of significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1,2 Positive G,A (Perc.)</td>
<td>10.206</td>
<td>4.01</td>
<td>9.23</td>
<td>2.37</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>0.05 level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3,4 Negative G,A (Perc.)</td>
<td>14.61</td>
<td>5.46</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.18</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>Not significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,5 Positive G,G (Perc.Id.)</td>
<td>11.83</td>
<td>4.64</td>
<td>5.62</td>
<td>1.21</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>Not significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2,6 Positive A,A (Perc.Id.)</td>
<td>11.59</td>
<td>4.54</td>
<td>20.56</td>
<td>4.52</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>0.01 level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3,7 Negative G,G (Perc.Id.)</td>
<td>13.35</td>
<td>4.99</td>
<td>11.93</td>
<td>2.39</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>0.05 level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4,8 Negative A,A (Perc.Id.)</td>
<td>14.278</td>
<td>5.34</td>
<td>4.93</td>
<td>1.18</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>Not significant</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 8.11

**Significance of Difference Between Means of Different Groups**

Presented in Table Nos. 6.15 and 6.34

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Column No.</th>
<th>SD_{pool}</th>
<th>( \bar{D} )</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Level of significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1,2 Positive G,A (Perc.)</td>
<td>10.116</td>
<td>3.97</td>
<td>8.38</td>
<td>2.11</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>0.05 level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3,4 Negative G,A (Perc.)</td>
<td>8.76</td>
<td>3.28</td>
<td>7.14</td>
<td>2.17</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>0.05 level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,5 Positive G,G (Perc.Id.)</td>
<td>11.36</td>
<td>4.45</td>
<td>14.99</td>
<td>3.36</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>0.01 level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2,6 Positive A,A (Perc.Id.)</td>
<td>13.197</td>
<td>5.17</td>
<td>3.62</td>
<td>1.70</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>Not significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3,7 Negative G,G (Perc.Id.)</td>
<td>10.505</td>
<td>3.93</td>
<td>14.07</td>
<td>3.58</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>0.01 level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4,8 Negative A,A (Perc.Id.)</td>
<td>11.15</td>
<td>4.17</td>
<td>4.93</td>
<td>1.18</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>Not significant</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 8.12
SIGNIFICANCE OF DIFFERENCE BETWEEN MEANS OF DIFFERENT GROUPS
PRESENTED IN TABLE NOS. 6.16 AND 6.35

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Column No.</th>
<th>SD_{Pool}</th>
<th>SE_D</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Level of significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1, 2 Positive</td>
<td>18.078</td>
<td>6.60</td>
<td>13.74</td>
<td>2.08</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>0.05 level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G, A (Perc.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Not significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3, 4 Negative</td>
<td>9.49</td>
<td>2.70</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>2.22</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>0.05 level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G, A (Perc.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Not significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1, 5 Positive</td>
<td>17.18</td>
<td>6.27</td>
<td>4.26</td>
<td>.47</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>Not significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G, G (Perc.Id.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Not significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2, 6 Positive</td>
<td>19.73</td>
<td>7.20</td>
<td>14.40</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>Not significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A, A (Perc.Id.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Not significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3, 7 Negative</td>
<td>9.505</td>
<td>2.699</td>
<td>9.72</td>
<td>3.60</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>0.01 level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G, G (Perc.Id.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Not significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4, 8 Negative</td>
<td>10.63</td>
<td>3.02</td>
<td>5.56</td>
<td>1.84</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>Not significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A, A (Perc.Id.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Not significant</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TABLE 8.13
SIGNIFICANCE OF DIFFERENCE BETWEEN MEANS OF DIFFERENT GROUPS
PRESENTED IN TABLE NOS. 6.17 AND 6.36

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Column No.</th>
<th>SD_{Pool}</th>
<th>SE_D</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Level of significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1, 2 Positive</td>
<td>17.154</td>
<td>6.24</td>
<td>7.20</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>Not significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G, A (Perc.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Not significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3, 4 Negative</td>
<td>13.05</td>
<td>3.66</td>
<td>7.76</td>
<td>2.10</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>0.05 level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G, A (Perc.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Not significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1, 5 Positive</td>
<td>16.78</td>
<td>6.12</td>
<td>21.20</td>
<td>3.46</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>0.01 level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G, G (Perc.Id.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Not significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2, 6 Positive</td>
<td>19.58</td>
<td>7.15</td>
<td>14.26</td>
<td>1.19</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>Not significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A, A (Perc.Id.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Not significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3, 7 Negative</td>
<td>13.44</td>
<td>3.80</td>
<td>22.48</td>
<td>5.91</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>0.01 level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G, G (Perc.Id.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Not significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4, 8 Negative</td>
<td>12.65</td>
<td>3.58</td>
<td>7.04</td>
<td>1.96</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>Not significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A, A (Perc.Id.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Not significant</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE 8.14

**SIGNIFICANCE OF DIFFERENCE BETWEEN MEANS OF DIFFERENT GROUPS PRESENTED IN TABLE NOS. 6.18 AND 6.37**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Column No.</th>
<th>SE_p</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Level of significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1,2 Positive G,A (Perc.)</td>
<td>2.45</td>
<td>4.30</td>
<td>1.75</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>0.10 level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3,4 Negative G,A (Perc.)</td>
<td>2.23</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>Not significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,5 Positive G,G (Perc.Id.)</td>
<td>2.79</td>
<td>11.20</td>
<td>4.01</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>0.01 level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2,6 Positive A,A (Perc.Id.)</td>
<td>2.63</td>
<td>4.55</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>0.10 level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3,7 Negative G,G (Perc.Id.)</td>
<td>3.04</td>
<td>8.30</td>
<td>2.89</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>0.01 level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4,8 Negative A,A (Perc.Id.)</td>
<td>3.01</td>
<td>1.45</td>
<td>.44</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>Not significant</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TABLE 8.15

**SIGNIFICANCE OF DIFFERENCE BETWEEN MEANS OF DIFFERENT GROUPS PRESENTED IN TABLE NOS. 6.19 AND 6.38**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Column No.</th>
<th>SE_p</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Level of Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1,2 Positive G,A (Perc.)</td>
<td>2.78</td>
<td>3.90</td>
<td>1.40</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>Not significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3,4 Negative G,A (Perc.)</td>
<td>2.27</td>
<td>4.30</td>
<td>1.89</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>0.10 level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,5 Positive G,G (Perc.Id.)</td>
<td>2.63</td>
<td>17.05</td>
<td>6.48</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>0.01 level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2,6 Positive A,A (Perc.Id.)</td>
<td>2.59</td>
<td>11.95</td>
<td>4.61</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>0.01 level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3,7 Negative G,G (Perc.Id.)</td>
<td>2.80</td>
<td>11.90</td>
<td>4.25</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>0.01 level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4,8 Negative A,A (Perc.Id.)</td>
<td>3.93</td>
<td>2.85</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>Not significant</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 8.16
SIGNIFICANCE OF DIFFERENCE BETWEEN MEANS OF DIFFERENT GROUPS PRESENTED IN TABLE NOS. 6.20 AND 6.21

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Column No.</th>
<th>SED</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Level of significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1,2 Ideal Gifted (M + F)</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>41.9</td>
<td>11.41</td>
<td>198</td>
<td>0.01 level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average (M + F)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,2 Ideal Males (G + A), Females (G + A)</td>
<td>4.58</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>1.06</td>
<td>198</td>
<td>Not significant</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TABLE 8.17
SIGNIFICANCE OF DIFFERENCE BETWEEN MEANS OF DIFFERENT GROUPS PRESENTED IN TABLE NO. 6.22

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Column No.</th>
<th>SED</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Level of significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1,2 Ideal G, A (Males)</td>
<td>5.15</td>
<td>7.60</td>
<td>1.48</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>Not significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3,4 Ideal G, A (Females)</td>
<td>4.51</td>
<td>24.80</td>
<td>5.49</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>0.01 level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,3 Ideal G,G (Males &amp; Females)</td>
<td>4.54</td>
<td>15.40</td>
<td>3.39</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>0.01 level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2,4 Ideal A,A (Males &amp; Females)</td>
<td>5.75</td>
<td>1.80</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>Not significant</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE 8.18
SIGNIFICANCE OF DIFFERENCE BETWEEN MEANS OF DIFFERENT GROUPS
PRESENTED IN TABLE NOS. 6.28 AND 6.24

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Column No.</th>
<th>SE_D</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Level of significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Positive (Ideal)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gifted (M + F)</td>
<td>1.37</td>
<td>7.35</td>
<td>4.68</td>
<td>338</td>
<td>0.01 level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average (M + F)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative (Ideal)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gifted (M + F)</td>
<td>1.45</td>
<td>9.10</td>
<td>6.27</td>
<td>338</td>
<td>0.01 level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average (M + F)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TABLE 8.19
SIGNIFICANCE OF DIFFERENCE BETWEEN MEANS OF DIFFERENT GROUPS
PRESENTED IN TABLE 6.25 AND 6.26

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Column No.</th>
<th>SE_D</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Level of significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Positive (Ideal)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Males (G + A)</td>
<td>1.58</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>338</td>
<td>Not significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Females (G + A)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative (Ideal)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Males (G + A)</td>
<td>1.29</td>
<td>3.60</td>
<td>2.79</td>
<td>338</td>
<td>0.01 level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Females (G + A)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE 3.20

**SIGNIFICANCE OF DIFFERENCE BETWEEN MEANS OF DIFFERENT GROUPS PRESENTED IN TABLE NOs. 6.27 AND 6.28**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Column No.</th>
<th>$S_{D}$</th>
<th>$D$</th>
<th>$t$</th>
<th>$df$</th>
<th>Level of significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Positive</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Total Id.) G, A (Males)</td>
<td>2.31</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>1.19</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>Not significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Total Id.) G, A (Females)</td>
<td>2.14</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>.93</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>Not significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Negative</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Total Id.) G, A (Males)</td>
<td>1.30</td>
<td>9.00</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>0.01 level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Total Id.) G, A (Females)</td>
<td>2.34</td>
<td>9.10</td>
<td>3.88</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>0.01 level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Positive</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Total Id.) G, G (Males, Females)</td>
<td>2.26</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>Not significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Negative</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Total Id.) G, G (Males, Females)</td>
<td>2.19</td>
<td>.65</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>Not significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Negative</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Total Id.) A, A (Males, Females)</td>
<td>1.86</td>
<td>.55</td>
<td>.295</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>Not significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Negative</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Total Id.) A, A (Males, Females)</td>
<td>2.28</td>
<td>.45</td>
<td>.197</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>Not significant</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE 8.21

**SIGNIFICANCE OF DIFFERENCE BETWEEN MEANS OF DIFFERENT GROUPS**
**PRESENTED IN TABLE NO. 6.39 AND 6.40**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Column No.</th>
<th>SE_D</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Level of significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1, 2 Discrep.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gifted (M + F) Average (M+F)</td>
<td>3.32</td>
<td>22.00</td>
<td>6.63</td>
<td>198</td>
<td>0.01 level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1, 2 Discrep.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Males (G+A) Females (G+A)</td>
<td>3.44</td>
<td>30.80</td>
<td>8.95</td>
<td>198</td>
<td>0.01 level</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TABLE 8.22

**SIGNIFICANCE OF DIFFERENCE BETWEEN MEANS OF DIFFERENT GROUPS**
**PRESENTED IN TABLE NO. 6.41**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Column No.</th>
<th>SE_D</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Level of significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1, 2 Discrep.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G, A (Males)</td>
<td>4.21</td>
<td>28.10</td>
<td>6.47</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>0.01 level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3, 4 Discrep.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G, A (Females)</td>
<td>4.87</td>
<td>2.60</td>
<td>.53</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>Not significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1, 3 Discrep.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G, G (Males &amp; Females)</td>
<td>4.92</td>
<td>3.40</td>
<td>.69</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>Not significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2, 4 Discrep.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A, A (Males &amp; Females)</td>
<td>4.15</td>
<td>36.60</td>
<td>8.82</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>0.01 level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column No.</td>
<td>SE_D</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>df</td>
<td>Level of Significance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Discrep.)</td>
<td>1.32</td>
<td>2.85</td>
<td>2.16</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>0.05 level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G, A (Males)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>1.45</td>
<td>1.30</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>Not significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Total Perc.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G, A (Females)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative</td>
<td>1.21</td>
<td>3.15</td>
<td>2.60</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>0.02 level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Total Perc.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G, A (Males)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative</td>
<td>1.68</td>
<td>.60</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>Not significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Total Perc.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G, A (Females)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>1.44</td>
<td>6.45</td>
<td>4.48</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>0.01 level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Total Perc.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G, G (Males, Females)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>1.32</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>6.06</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>0.01 level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Total Perc.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A, A (Males, Females)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative</td>
<td>1.62</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>.49</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>Not significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Total Perc.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G, G (Males, Females)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative</td>
<td>1.29</td>
<td>4.65</td>
<td>3.60</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>0.01 level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Total Perc.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A, A (Males, Females)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE 8.24

SIGNIFICANCE OF DIFFERENCE BETWEEN MEANS OF DIFFERENT GROUPS PRESENTED IN TABLE NOS. 6.44 AND 6.45

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Column No.</th>
<th>SD Pool</th>
<th>SE D</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Level of significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Positive G, A (Discrepancy)</td>
<td>8.06</td>
<td>2.22</td>
<td>2.07</td>
<td>.93</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>Not significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative G, A (Perc. Real)</td>
<td>4.68</td>
<td>1.26</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.087</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>Not significant</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TABLE 8.25

CORRELATIONS BETWEEN DIFFERENT GROUPS PRESENTED IN TABLE NOS. 6.46 AND 6.47

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Column No.</th>
<th>Size of Sample (N)</th>
<th>Degrees of Freedom (N-2)</th>
<th>Calculated r</th>
<th>Interpretation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Positive (Perc., Real Gifted Females)</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>-.079</td>
<td>Not significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive (Perc., Real) Average Females</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>-.15</td>
<td>Not significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative (Perc., Real) Gifted Females</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>Not significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative (Perc., Real) Average Females</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>Not significant</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE 8.26
SIGNIFICANCE OF DIFFERENCE BETWEEN MEANS OF DIFFERENT GROUPS PRESENTED IN TABLE NOS. 6.46 and 6.47

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of significance</th>
<th>SE_d</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>df</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Real (Positive)</td>
<td>2.93</td>
<td>4.36</td>
<td>1.49</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gifted-Average Femaless</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Females</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Real (Negative)</td>
<td>1.38</td>
<td>.77</td>
<td>.55</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gifted-Average Femaless</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TABLE 8.27
SIGNIFICANCE OF DIFFERENCE BETWEEN MEANS OF DIFFERENT GROUPS PRESENTED IN TABLE 7.1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A_i</th>
<th>A_2</th>
<th>A_3</th>
<th>A_4</th>
<th>A_5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M = 130.75</td>
<td>D = 7.70</td>
<td>D = 8.55</td>
<td>D = 5.15</td>
<td>D = 9.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD = 16.83</td>
<td>$ \text{t} = 1.97$</td>
<td>$ \text{t} = .287$</td>
<td>$ \text{t} = 1.13$</td>
<td>$ \text{t} = 2.46$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N = 40</td>
<td>Not Sign.</td>
<td>$ \text{t} = .05$</td>
<td>Not sign.</td>
<td>$ \text{t} = .05$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| M = 138.45 | D = .75 | D = 2.55 | D = 1.7 |
| SD = 18.02 | $ \text{t} = .15$ | $ \text{t} = .47$ | $ \text{t} = .33$ |

| M = 139.20 | D = 3.3 | D = .95 |
| SD = 15.32 | $ \text{t} = .80$ | $ \text{t} = .26$ |
| N = 40 | Not signi. | Not signi. |

| M = 135.90 | D = 4.25 |
| SD = 20.71 | $ \text{t} = .99$ |
| N = 40 | Not signi. |

<p>| M = 140.15 |
| SD = 17.3 |
| N = 40 |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>A1</th>
<th>A2</th>
<th>A3</th>
<th>A4</th>
<th>A5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>205.72</td>
<td>203.22</td>
<td>204.97</td>
<td>208.27</td>
<td>208.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>19.02</td>
<td>19.28</td>
<td>13.21</td>
<td>19.23</td>
<td>22.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>1.75</td>
<td>3.30</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>±.55</td>
<td>±.47</td>
<td>±.62</td>
<td>±.07</td>
<td>±.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>t</td>
<td>.58</td>
<td>.47</td>
<td>.89</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>t</td>
<td>2.05</td>
<td>1.17</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>.015</td>
<td>.015</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Tables 8.1 and 8.2 give the results on the basis of the frequency distributions of composite scores for the Perceived-Self of the Gifted and Average Males and Females, presented in Tables 6.1, 6.2, and 6.3. The t-ratios for Gifted and Average Males and Females are 1.53 and 1.52 (not significant), respectively. The t-ratio between the Gifted (Males and Females) is 1.26 (not significant) and between the Average (Males and Females) is 2.20 (significant at .05 level). The means show that the gifted group (both Males and Females) perceive themselves more favourably when compared to the Average Groups. (The method of analyzing the composite scores has been explained elaborately in chapter five). The differences in both the cases are not significant. The means show that the Males rate themselves more favourably than the Females, though the difference is significant only in the case of Average Group. The t-ratio (Table 8.1) for Gifted (Males + Females) and Average (Males + Females) is .35 (not significant), while it is 1.32 (not significant) for Males (Gifted + Average) and Females (Gifted + Average). The means show that the gifted have a favourable approach towards themselves. The means further show the Male group rating itself favourably than the Female group, though the differences are not significant in both the cases.
These results show that the Gifted and Average Males, Gifted and Average Females, Gifted Males and Females, (Gifted + Average) Males and Females, (Males + Females) Gifted and Average, though have their own particular trends, do not differ from each other significantly. The only significant difference occurs between the Average Males and Females.

8.4. t-RATIOS FOR GIFTED AND AVERAGE GROUPS

Table 8.3 shows the results of the frequency distributions given in Tables 6.4 and 6.5 for all the words, divided into positive and negative categories. The scores have been found out for the Gifted and Average groups by combining the Males and Females in both the cases. The t-ratio between the Gifted (Males + Females) and Average (Males + Females) was found to be 1.22 (not significant for the positive category). For the negative category the same is .04, which again is not significant. The means do not show much favourability in any of the two cases.

The results show that the Gifted and Average groups do not differ much in their self-perceptions. Moreover, these small differences are not significant.

8.5. t-RATIOS FOR MALE AND FEMALE GROUPS

Tables 6.6 and 6.7 contain the frequency distributions of scores, for the total words, of Males and Females, with Gifted and Average Groups combined, for the positive and negative
categories separately. The results are given in Table 8.4. The t-ratio for positive category, between the Males (Gifted + Average) and Females (Gifted + Average) is 3.75, which is significant at .01 level. For the negative category, it is 2.81 which again is significant at .01 level. Means presented in Tables 6.6 and 6.7 give out a favourable picture of Males in comparison with Females, the difference being in favour of the Male group.

These results show that the total Male sample has better (and significant) self-perceptions as compared to those of the total Female sample.

8.6. t-RATIOS FOR ALL THE DIMENSIONS COMBINED TOGETHER FOR PERCEIVED SELF

The results presented in Table 8.5 have been derived from the frequency distributions given in Tables 6.8 and 6.9, containing separate distributions of scores on all the words (in statement form) falling in positive and negative categories, for gifted and average Males and Females. For the positive category, the t-ratios are 1.12 (not significant) for Gifted-Average Males, 2.61 (significant at .01 level) for Gifted-Average Females. For the negative category, they are 1.32 (not significant) and 1.34 (not significant) for Gifted-Average Males and Females, respectively. The t-ratios between the Gifted Males and Females are 4.61 (significant at .01 level) and 3.21 (significant at .01 level) for the positive and negative categories, respectively. In the case of Average Males
and Females, the t-ratios are .75 (not significant) and .62 (not significant), for both the categories (positive and negative), respectively. The means for these distributions show, that the Gifted Males perceive themselves favourably, while the Gifted Females do it otherwise, but their differences are not significant except in the case of Gifted and Average Females for the positive category. The means also show, that in all the cases the Gifted and Average Males rate themselves favourably than the Gifted and Average Females. Their differences are significant in the case of the Gifted Group only.

These results show, that on the whole the Gifted and Average groups do not differ from each other for their self-perceptions, in most of the cases. Only for the Female groups the differences have come out as significant on the positive category. The results further show, that Gifted Males rate themselves in a significantly better way than the Gifted Females. Though the Average Males also have better self perceptions than the Average Females but their differences are not significant.

8.7. t-RATIOS, STATEMENT-WISE ANALYSIS

Tables 8.6 to 8.15 give the results derived from the Tables 6.10 to 6.19 and 6.29 to 6.38, containing word-wise scores or frequency distributions of the Gifted and Average Males and Females for Perceived
and Ideal-Self, on different dimensions studied by the SCL. In each dimension the scores are given separately for the positive and negative categories.

8.8. t-RATIOS FOR THE DIMENSION OF INTELLIGENCE

Table 8.6 shows the t-ratios for Males, on the dimension of Intelligence, while Table 8.7 shows the same for Females. The t-ratio of 2.29 for the positive category of Perceived Self, between the Gifted and Average Males, is significant at .05 level, while for the negative category it amounts to 2.96 and is significant at .01 level. For Females, it is 1.02 on positive category and for negative category the ratio is 2.53. In the former case it is not significant, while in the latter case it is significant at .05 level. Their means, given in Tables 6.10, 6.29, 6.11 and 6.30 respectively, show that the Gifted Males rate themselves favourably on both positive and negative categories of intelligence in comparison to the Average Males. The differences between the two groups are significant in both the cases. In the case of Females, the Average Group rates itself more favourably than the Gifted Group for both positive and negative categories, though the difference is significant only in the latter case. The above mentioned tables also contain the t-ratios found between the Perceived and Ideal-Self, within the same group of subjects. The t-ratio between the two selves of Gifted Males for positive category, is .78
and for negative category it is 1.21. Both of these are not significant. For Gifted Females also (in Table 8.7) the same type of results have been found. The t-ratios are 2.04 and 2.09 for both positive and negative categories respectively, and they are not significant. Though the means of all the four groups (given in Tables 6.10, 6.29, 6.11 and 6.30) go in favour of Ideal-Self i.e. the ratings for the Ideal-Self are more favourable than those for the Perceived-Self, their differences are not significant. For the Average Males the t-ratio for positive category is 2.18 and for negative category it is 2.30. Both of these are significant at .05 level. For Females the t-ratio is 2.20 for positive and .053 for negative category. In the former case, it is significant at .05 level and in the latter case it is not significant. The means in the case of Average Males and Average Females go in favour of the Ideal-Self. The above mentioned results show that the Gifted Males differ significantly from the Average Males on the dimension of Intelligence, for both positive and negative categories of Perceived-Self, and these differences are favourable for the Gifted Group. The Gifted Females differ from the Average Females significantly in the negative case only, and in both the cases the Average Group ratings are more favourable than the Gifted Group ratings. The differences between the Perceived-Self and Ideal-Self are not significant in the case of the Gifted
Males and Females, which means that these groups have almost the same types of selves as far as the dimension of Intelligence is concerned. It does not mean that the differences are absolutely missing, because they are existing and are going in favour of the Ideal-Self, but they are not significantly different from each other. In the case of Average Males and Females, there are significant differences in what they think of themselves and in what they would like to be. It is so in all the cases except in the case of Average Females for the negative category, where the difference is not significant.

8.9. t-RATIOS FOR THE DIMENSION 6.32 contain the Perceived and AESTHETIC Ideal-Self scores for the positive and negative categories of Aesthetic, for Males and Females, respectively. The results of these scores are presented in Tables 8.8 and 8.9 for Males and Females, respectively. The t-ratios for the positive category of the Perceived-Self are 1.3 (not significant) for Gifted-Average Males, .48 (not significant) for Gifted-Average Females. The t-ratios for the negative category are .37 (not significant) in the former case, and .05 (not significant) in the latter case. The t-ratios for the positive category of Perceived-Ideal Self are 2.1 (not significant) for Gifted Males, 3.45 (significant at .01 level) for Gifted Females, 1.79 (not
significant) for Average Males, 3.97 (significant at .01 level) for Average Females. The same for the negative category are 1.79 (not significant) for Gifted Males, 2.88 (significant at .05 level) for Gifted Females, .73 (not significant) for Average Males and 1.05 (not significant) for Average Females.

These results show that for the dimension of Aesthetic the Gifted and Average Males hold no significant differences, though the means of the scores show the favourable trend towards the Gifted in the negative category, unfavourable in the positive category of Perceived-Self, favourable for the Ideal-Self in all the cases except in the case of Average Males for negative category.

For the Female Group (Table 8.9) the differences between the Gifted and Average are not significant for both the categories of Perceived-Self, though their means show a favourable tendency towards the Gifted in negative category and towards the Average in the positive category. The differences between the Perceived-Self and Ideal-Self are significant for the Gifted Group in both the cases, while it is significant for the Average Group in positive case, and not significant for the negative category. The trend of the means go in favour of the Ideal-Self.
All these results show that the Gifted and Average Males and Females do not differ significantly from each other on the dimension of Aesthetic. The Gifted and Average Males do not have significant differences between their Perceived and Ideal-Self, while the Females hold significant differences between the two selves, in all the cases except in the case of Average Group for negative category. The trends of means are favourable for the Ideal-Self.

8.10. t-RATIOS FOR THE DIMENSION OF SOCIAL ADJUSTMENT

Tables 8.10 and 8.11 present the results for Males and Females, respectively. They are derived from the scores given in Tables 6.14, 6.33 and 6.15, 6.34, for both the Perceived and Ideal-Selves, on the positive and negative categories, of the Gifted and Average Males and Females. The t-ratios for both the categories of Perceived-Self are 2.37, (significant at .05 level) for Gifted-Average Males, 2.11 (significant at .05 level) for Gifted-Average Females on the positive category. For the negative, they are .18 (not significant) for Gifted-Average Males, 2.17 (significant at .05 level) for Gifted-Average Females. The t-ratios for the Perceived and Ideal-Self on positive category are 1.21 (not significant) for Gifted Males, 3.36 (significant at .01 level) for Gifted Females, 4.52 (significant at .01 level) for Average Males, and .70 (not significant) for Average
Females. In the case of negative category, the t-ratios are, 2.39 (significant at .05 level) for Gifted Males, 3.58 (significant at .01 level) for Gifted Females, .14 (not significant) for Average Males and 1.18 (not significant) for Average Females. The means of these scores for the perceived-self show that the differences of Gifted and Average Males go in favour of the gifted for positive, and they go in favour of the Average for negative category, the difference is significant in the first case only. The means for Perceived-Self and Ideal-Self go in favour of the Ideal-Self, though the differences are significant only in the case of negative category for Gifted Males, and in positive category for Average Males. The means for the female group show a favourable trend towards the Average Group in both the cases, and the differences are significant also. For Perceived-Self and Ideal-Self, the means go in favour of the Ideal-Self, though the differences are significant only for the gifted in both the positive and negative cases.

These results show that the Gifted Males differ significantly from the Average Males, in a favourable direction, for the positive category of the Perceived-Self, and the Average Females differ significantly from the Gifted Group by rating themselves more favourably in both the positive and negative cases. The Gifted Males have significant differences between their Perceived-and
Ideal-Self scores for the negative category only, while the Average group holds significant differences in the case of the positive category. The Gifted Females have significant differences between their Perceived- and Ideal-Self for both Positive and negative categories. The Ideal-Self scores are higher than the Perceived-Self scores in all the cases.

8.11. t-RATIOS FOR THE DIMENSION OF EMOTIONAL ADJUSTMENT

Table 6.16, 6.36 and 6.17, 6.36 contain the Perceived-Self and Ideal-Self Scores on the positive and negative categories of Gifted and Average Males and Females, respectively. Their results are presented in Tables 8.12 and 8.13, respectively. For the positive category of the Perceived-Self, t-ratio of 2.08 (significant at .05 level) is found for Gifted and Average Males, and it is 1.15 (not significant) for Gifted and Average Females. For negative category, they are 2.22 and 2.10 for Males and Females (Gifted-Average). Both of these are significant at .05 level.

The t-ratios between the Perceived- and Ideal-Self are .67 (not significant) for Gifted Males, 3.46 (significant at .01 level) for Gifted Females, 2.0 (not significant) for Average Males and 1.19 (not significant) for Average Females, on the positive category. On the negative category, they are 3.60 (significant at .01 level) for Gifted Males, 5.91 (significant at .01
level) for Gifted Females, 1.84 (not significant) for Average Males and 1.96 (not significant) for Average Females. The means for Male Groups for the Perceived-Self show a favourable trend towards the Gifted for both the categories and the differences are significant (.05 level) also. The differences between the Perceived-Self and Ideal-Self are favourable for the Ideal-Self in all the cases of Male groups, though the differences are significant (.01 level) only in the case of Gifted group for the negative category. For Females the means show the Average group to be in a favourable position for Perceived-Self, though the difference is significant (.05 level) only in the negative case. The differences between the Perceived-Self and Ideal-Self show a favourable trend towards Ideal-Self, though these differences are significant (.01 level) only in the case of Gifted Females.

The above results show, that the Gifted Males perceive themselves in a significantly better way than the Average Males. In the case of Females, the situation is in the reverse order, although the difference is significant only in the case of negative category. The Gifted Males have a significantly higher mean for the Ideal-Self in comparison to Perceived-Self. In the case of Gifted Females there are significant differences between the Perceived-Self and Ideal-Self in both the categories. This group holds high Ideal-Self means in both the cases.
8.12. **t-RATIOS FOR THE DIMENSION OF CHARACTER**

The results presented in Tables 8.14 and 8.15, for the frequency distributions given in Tables 6.18, 6.37 and 6.19, 6.38, give the following t-ratios. They are 1.75 (significant at .10 level), 1.40 (not significant) for Gifted-Average Males and Gifted-Average Females, respectively, on the positive category. On the negative category, they are .11 (not significant) for Gifted-Average Males and 1.89 (significant at .10 level) for Gifted-Average Females. The t-ratios between Perceived and Ideal-Selves are 4.01 (significant at .01 level) for Gifted Males, 6.48 (significant at .01 level) for Gifted Females, 1.73 (significant at .10 level) for Average Males and 4.61 (significant at .01 level) for Average Females, on the positive category, while they are 2.89 (significant at .01 level) for Gifted Males, 4.25 (significant at .01 level) for Gifted Females, .44 (not significant) for Average Males and .72 (not significant) for Average Females, on the negative category. The means go in favour of the Average Males, though these differences are either significant at a very low level (.10) or are not significant at all. The means for Perceived-Self and Ideal-Self show the favourable trend towards Ideal-Self. These trends are significant in the case of Gifted Males. They are either not significant or are significant at a very low level (.10), for the Average Male Group. In the case of Females, for the positive category, the means go in favour of
Average Group, while it is otherwise for the negative category, though these differences are either not significant or are significant at .10 level. In this group the differences between Perceived and Ideal-Self are all in favour of the Ideal-Self. Moreover, these differences are significant in all the cases, except in the case of Average Females on the negative category.

These results show, that although the Gifted Males perceive themselves in a better way than the Average Males, their differences are not significant. In the case of the Females, the Gifted perceive themselves favourably on the negative statements and the Average do the same on the positive statements. But their differences, in the self-perceptions, are not significant. The results further show, that in the case of Gifted Males as well as Females, the Ideal-Self is significantly higher than the Perceived-Self, while in the case of Average Males and Females, the differences are not significant in all the cases, except in the case of Average Females for the negative category.

8.12c. T-RATIOS FOR THE TOTAL IDEAL SELF COMPOSITE SCORES Tables 8.16 and 8.17 give the t-ratios for the Ideal-Self composite scores on both Gifted and Average Males and Females. Tables 6.20, 6.21 and 6.22, hold the frequency distributions from which these results were derived. The t-ratio between Gifted and Average Males is 1.48 (not significant), between the Gifted and Average Females it is 5.49 (significant at .01 level), between Gifted Males and
Females it is 3.39 (significant at .01 level) and between Average Males and Females it is .31 (not significant). The means (columns 1 and 2, 3 and 4 Table 6.22) show that the Gifted Groups (both Males and Females) have higher Ideal-Self scores than the Average groups, though the difference is significant only in the case of Females. The means (columns 1, and 3, 2 and 4 Table 6.22) show that the Gifted Females have greater Ideal-Self aspirations than the Gifted Males and the differences between them are significant. The differences between the Average groups are not significant, though they go in favour of the Males. The t-ratio (Table 8.16) between Gifted (Males + Females) and Average (Males + Females) is 11.41 (significant .01 level) and between Males and Females (Gifted + Average) it is 1.06 (not significant). The means show the Gifted Males as having higher Ideal-Self score than that of the Average group and also show that the Females possess a higher Ideal score than the Male group, though this difference is not significant in the latter case. The Gifted Females aspire higher than the Average Females and their difference is significant. Gifted Females have significantly higher aspirations than the Gifted Males. The differences between Average Males and Females are very low and not significant also. The results further show that the Males and Females do not differ much on the ideal-self, but in the case of gifted and Average the results are significant.
8.13 t-RATIOS FOR GIFTED AND AVERAGE GROUPS

Tables 6.23 and 6.24 consist of the frequency distributions for the positive and negative Ideal-Self scores of Gifted (Males + Females) and Average (Males + Females). Their results are given in Table 8.18. The t-ratios found for the positive and negative categories, are 4.68 (significant at .01 level) and 6.27 (significant at .01 level) respectively, for the Gifted (Males + Females) and Average (Males + Females). The means show that the Gifted Group holds a higher Ideal-Self than that of the Average Group in both positive and negative cases. The results show that the Gifted aspire for a higher Ideal-Self than the Average Group. These differences are significant.

8.14 t-RATIOS FOR MALE AND FEMALE GROUPS

Table 8.19 gives the results of positive and negative ideal-self scores of Males (Gifted + Average) and Females (Gifted + Average). Their frequency distributions are given in Tables 6.25 and 6.26. The t-ratio for the positive category is .16 (not significant), and for the negative category, it is 2.79 (significant at .01 level), for Males (G + A) and Females (G + A). The means for these distributions show that the Females rate themselves favourably on the negative category, while the difference between the two means is .35 only for the positive category, which is very low.
The above results show that the males and females do not differ much in their 'Ideal-Self' aspirations on the positive category, while on the negative category the aspirations of female group are higher than the male group.

8.15. *t-RATIOS FOR ALL THE DIMENSIONS TOGETHER FOR IDEAL SELF*

In Tables 6.27 and 6.28 the frequency distributions of the scores for all the words (in the statement form), on the basis of positive and negative categories, are given separately for the Gifted and Average Males and Females. In Table 8.20 are given the results of these scores. The *t*-ratio found between the Gifted and Average Males is 1.19 (not significant), and .93 (not significant) for Females (Gifted and Average) for the positive category. In the negative category, they are 5.0 (significant at .01 level) for Males and 3.88 (significant at .01 level) for Females. The *t*-ratios between Males and Females are .04 (not significant) and .295 (not significant) for the Gifted on positive and negative categories, respectively. For the Average groups, on both the categories they are .29 (not significant) and .197 (not significant). The means show that the Gifted Groups (Males as well as Females) have higher Ideal-Self than the Average Groups, though their differences are significant only in the case of negative category. The means between Gifted Males and Females do not differ much from each other, and that is why these differences are not significant.
The above results show that the Gifted Males and Females aspire for higher Ideals than the Average Males and Females, though their differences are significant only in the case of negative statements. The Gifted Males and Females as well as Average Males and Females do not differ much from each other in their ratings on Ideal-Self.

8.16. t-RATIOS FOR THE DISCREPANCIES BETWEEN PERCEIVED AND IDEAL-SELF COMPOSITE SCORES

Tables 8.21 and 8.22 have been derived from the frequency distributions presented in Tables 6.39, 6.40 and 6.41.

These distributions give the discrepancy scores between the Perceived and Ideal-Self composite scores, for both the Gifted and the Average Males and Females. The t-ratio between Gifted and Average Males was found to be 6.79, which is significant at .01 level, the t-ratio between Females was .53 (not significant), between the Gifted Males and Females it was .69 (not significant) and between the Average Males and Females it was 8.82 (significant at .01 level). The means show, that the Gifted Males hold significantly higher discrepancies than the Average Males. In the case of Females, the differences are very small and are not significant. The means show, that the discrepancies are greater in the case of Females, but they are
significant only in the case of Average Groups. The t-ratio (Table 8.21) between Males and Females (Gifted + Average) is 8.95 (significant at .01 level) and it is 6.63 (significant at .01 level) between Gifted and Average (Males + Females). The means show that the Females have significantly greater discrepancies than the Males, and they further show that the Gifted group holds significantly greater discrepancies than the Average Group.

The above results prove, that the Gifted Males in comparison to Average Males, Average Females in comparison to Average Males, Female Group in comparison to Male Group and Gifted Group in comparison to Average Group, possess greater discrepancies between the Perceived and Ideal-Self Scores. In the case of Gifted and Average Females, Gifted Males and Females, the differences are low and not significant.

8.17. t-RATIOS FOR THE DISCREPANCIES BETWEEN PERCEIVED AND IDEAL-SELF

In Table 6.42 and 6.43 the frequency distributions of discrepancies scores for the total number of words (in statement form), divided into positive and negative categories, are given for the Gifted and Average Male and Female groups. The results are given in Table 8.23. The t-ratio for the Gifted-Average Males is 2.16 (significant at .05 level) and .89 (not significant) for Gifted-Average Females, for the positive category. For the negative category, they are 2.60 (significant
at .02 level and almost significant at .01 level) and .35 (not significant) for Males and Females, respectively. The t-ratios between the gifted groups and average groups separately are, 4.48 (significant at .01 level) for Gifted Males and Females, 6.06 (significant at .01 level) for Average Males and Females, for the positive category. For the negative category, they are .49 (not significant) for Gifted and 3.60 (significant at .01 level) for Average Males and Females. The means for these discrepancy scores show, that the Gifted Males and Females have greater discrepancies than the Average Males and Females for the positive statements, while for the negative statements the Average Males have greater discrepancies than the Gifted Males, and for the Females the difference is almost negligible for the positive and negative categories. The differences are significant for Males and are not significant for Females. The differences between Males and Females show, that the discrepancies are greater for Females in positive group, and for Males in negative group. The differences are significant in all the cases except in the case of Gifted Group for negative category.

The above results show, that the discrepancies between the Perceived and Ideal-Selves are significantly greater in the case of Gifted Males compared to Average Males. Moreover, for the positive category, the
Gifted Males and Females as well as Average Males and Females differ significantly, with the latter (Females) having greater discrepancy than the first group (Males). For the negative category, the Average Male group holds significantly greater discrepancy when compared to the Average Female Group.

8.18. t-RATIOS FOR THE DISCREPANCIES BETWEEN THE PERCEIVED AND REAL SELF

Table 8.24 consists of the t-ratios for the discrepancy scores between the perceived and real-self of gifted and Average females on positive and negative categories separately. Table 6.44 and 6.45 contain their frequency distributions. The t-ratios between the discrepancies of perceived-real self of the gifted and Average females are .92 and .087, for the positive and negative categories, respectively. Both these values are not significant. The means show that the discrepancies are greater in the case of the Average group in comparison to the gifted group. The differences for the negative category are almost negligible and in both the cases the differences are not significant.

8.19. 'r' BETWEEN THE PERCEIVED AND REAL SELF

Table 8.25 consists of the results obtained on the basis of the frequency distributions, presented in Tables 6.46 and
6.47 for positive and negative categories separately. The calculated 'r' value is -.079 for gifted females, and -.15 for average females on the positive category, between perceived and real self. Both these correlations are not significant. The 'r' between the perceived and real-self of gifted females is .25, and for average females it is .04, on the negative category. Both these correlations are not significant. The means in Tables 6.46 and 6.47 show that the differences for the Gifted on the positive category are very low and the 'r' is not significant, while in the case of Average group the ratings on the Perceived-Self are much more favourable than the ratings on the Real-Self. In the case of negative category, the Gifted and Average Groups have favourable Perceived-Self means as compared to the Real-Self means. The differences are not significant in any of these two cases. The above results show, that the Average Group rates itself much more favourably than it is rated by the Teacher. In the case of the Gifted, in the positive cases the difference is extremely low, while for negative category also it is not high. All the abovementioned correlations are 'Not Significant'.

8.20. t-RATIOS Table 8.25 consists of the results obtained on the basis of the frequency distributions presented in Tables 6.46 and 6.47. The t-ratios for the Real-Self of the Gifted and Average
Females are not significant. Though the result is not significant, yet the ratings are more favourable for the Average group as compared to the gifted group, in the positive category. The nature of the differences show that had the sample been larger, the differences could come out as significant. Since it was not possible to get more data, as has already been explained in chapter 'Five' for the Real-Self, the analysis was done on the small number of ratings, which could be collected for the present study. The results show that the Average students are rated more favourably as compared to the Gifted students. This may be because an ordinary teacher can neither understand nor appreciate the gifted persons. Due to their high intelligence the Gifted are more mature, curious and independent than the Average student. The teacher weighs this difference on the basis of the social norms, without going beyond it. In the behaviour of the Gifted Females they see a challenge to the social norms of the society. Thus, instead of getting any praise for their high intellectual abilities, the Gifted Females are ridiculed and are underrated by the teachers.

8.21. t-RATIOS FOR THE DIFFERENT AGE GROUPS

Tables 8.27 and 8.28 consist of the results obtained on the basis of the scores presented in Tables 7.1 and 7.4 respectively. The t-ratios were
worked out to know the significance of the difference between the means of the five age groups namely, $A_1$ (fourteen to fifteen), $A_2$ (fifteen to sixteen), $A_3$ (sixteen to seventeen), $A_4$ (seventeen to eighteen) and $A_5$ (eighteen plus). The t-ratios have been found out separately for the positive and negative categories. The t-ratios in the former case show that the groups $A_1$ and $A_3$, and $A_1$ and $A_5$ differ from each other significantly. In the case of the latter category no significant differences have been found out. These results show that the adolescents at the lower age levels perceive themselves more favourably as compared to those at the higher age levels. With the advancement of age there is a gradual and constant rise in the scores on the positive category, which again supports the above finding. Social desirability and undesirability plays a very important role in the self-perceptions of the individuals. Those who are at the lower age levels are much more conscious about the wishes of their parents and society, moreover, there is an immediate fear of punishment. Thus these groups adhere more to the set norms and are praised for this by the parents and others. On the other hand the adolescents at higher age levels, get more conscious about their freedom and it affects their behaviour. But this is very much ridiculed and criticised by the society. This
criticism affects the adolescents in their self-ratings. In the case of the negative category, the results show that the fear of stigma, which is sure to be attached to them, if they go against the wishes of the parents and others, is felt equally by all the adolescents. Possession of negative characteristics is worse than the lack of positive characteristics for a person. Moreover, any society is almost normal in its reaction to the positive characteristics, while it gets almost intolerant in the case of socially undesirable characteristics. This can explain the present results.

The above interpretations have brought out different types of results. These will be discussed in chapter 'Nine'. The discussion will be able to throw light on the different aspects of the Gifted and their Self-Concepts.